11-1-1963

Calvinism in England During the Reformation Period as Seen in the Formularies of the Established Church

Walter Sohn
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_sohnw@csl.edu

CALVINISM AND THE ENGLISH FORMULARIES; Sohn; S.T.M., 1963

CALVINISM IN ENGLAND DURING THE REFORMATION PERIOD AS SEEN IN THE FORMULARIES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Walter G. Sohn

November 1963

Approved by: Carl S. Meyer
Advisor

Herbert T. Mayer
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The object of this thesis is to trace the introduction of Calvinism into the official and unofficial formularies of the Church of England during the Reformation period. Calvinism is defined as any distinctive theological teaching advocated by John Calvin, the leader of the Reformed Church during the middle of the sixteenth century. The official formularies were the confessional statements and prescribed forms of worship ordered to be used in the established Church by the English monarch. The unofficial formularies were theological writings approved by Convocation of the English clergy. While used in the Church, they had neither the approval of the crown nor that of the English Parliament. They are important for the topic inasmuch as they provide an insight into the theology of the day.

John Calvin was not one of the early reformers of the sixteenth century. He was born in 1509 and was but eight years old when Martin Luther posted his Ninety-Five Theses on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. Calvin's early interests were those of a humanist rather than those of a theologian. His first major work was a Commentary on Lucius Anneas Seneca's Two Books on Clemency published in 1532. The date of Calvin's conversion to the evangelical cause has been the matter of some speculation. A remark made by Calvin in his Commentary on the Psalms would seem to indicate that in 1533

he was still a Roman Catholic.

Towards the end of that year John Calvin was accused of being familiar with Nicholas Cop, an evangelical and the rector of the university of Paris. Calvin was accused of guilt by association, not with being an evangelical himself. Calvin was forced to flee and go underground. Not long afterward Calvin broke with the Catholic Church. In May 1534 he resigned his clerical benefices, and thereafter he busied himself promoting the cause of the Reformed Church. By that time the Lutheran and the Helvetic Reformations had already been well established.

Calvin was a follower of the earlier reformers rather than an innovator. He built on the foundations that others had laid. His chief contribution was to give a systematic understanding to Reformed theology. Calvin accomplished this through his many theological treatises.

Like other reformers John Calvin borrowed much from the writings of Martin Luther. An evangelical spirit marks much of his writings. Like Luther, Calvin sought to base his theology strictly upon the Word of God. The two divines did not always agree on the interpretation of Scripture. It was this difference which led to the identification of certain doctrines as being Lutheran or Calvinist.

Calvinism absorbed much of the theology of the leaders of the Helvetic Reformation, particularly that of the mediating theologians. Calvin's teachings on the Sacrament of the Altar are closer to those of Henry Bullinger and Martin Bucer

than to those of Martin Luther or Ulrich Zwingli. Bucer and Bullinger have been called heralds of Calvin rather than his rivals.

The divisive doctrine of the day was the interpretation of the Lord's Supper. Not only did this doctrine separate Protestantism from Roman Catholicism, it also divided Protestants into different camps. The Roman Catholic Church held that the bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ at the moment of consecration. Ulrich Zwingli, the father of the Helvetic Reformation, taught that the elements were bare symbols. Luther disagreed with both of these interpretations. He maintained that the communicant actually received the true body and blood of Christ in, with, and under the bread and wine. Some Swiss reformers advocated a compromise view between that of Zwingli and Luther. These theologians believed that the worthy communicant received the true body and blood of Christ, not corporally but spiritually. John Calvin adopted this latter view.

Involved in the interpretation was the doctrine of Christology. The evangelicals were divided on the implications of Christ's visible ascent into heaven. The Zwinglians and the mediating theologians held that the body of Christ is now locally circumscribed at the right hand of God and therefore cannot be physically present in the Lord's Supper. Luther, holding to the communication of attributes in the person of Christ, taught that Christ can be and is present physically in the Lord's Supper. As a consequence, the Swiss

reformers referred to the followers of Luther as ubiquitarians, while the Lutherans referred to the Swiss as sacramentarians.

Since the reformers were not able to agree on the interpretation of the Sacrament of the Altar, this doctrine has been chosen to measure the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England. In most of the other doctrinal areas the evangelicals spoke with a united voice against the teachings of Roman Catholicism. This does not mean that all of the reformers and their followers were in complete doctrinal agreement in such areas, but other issues were either not in contention or they were not considered divisive.

Most of the formularies of the English Church during the Reformation period were very brief. Only a few of them were articles of faith. Most of them were forms of worship. In most cases only a few sentences or a few words were devoted to the Lord's Supper. In such cases it is a problem to be specific, and positively to identify a teaching as Lutheran, Reformed, or Roman Catholic.

The extant writings of the influential leaders of the English Church were searched for possible clues of the intended interpretation of the wording used. Some information was also taken from the correspondence these men had with each other and with some of the continental divines. The dating of these writings and letters also must be considered, since some of the English leaders apparently changed their mind on their interpretation of the Lord's Supper.

Some of the formularies were drawn up under the pressures of the world situation of the Reformation period. Political opportunism played an important part in the framing of some of the articles of faith. The insistence by Lutheran leaders upon doctrinal agreement before they would agree to an alliance with England resulted in meetings between Lutheran and English theologians. Confessions drawn up under such circumstances which were mutually acceptable should tend to indicate that a Lutheran interpretation should be placed upon the wording used. The brevity of the article of the Lord's Supper might indicate, however, that the commissioners could not agree beyond the points stated.

During the Edwardian era some of the prescribed forms were submitted to Reformed divines for their criticism. These theologians had been invited to England to assist in the English Reformation. Dissatisfaction with the terminology used in the formulary would tend to indicate that the Reformed theologians disagreed with the doctrine as it was expressed. The acceptance of the criticism by such Reformed divines or the rejection of their comments should tend to indicate the view of the composers of the formulary. Of increasing importance during this era was the question of rites and ceremonies. Calvinists were generally opposed to their retention.

The Counter-Reformation of the Marian period resulted in the removal of Protestant formularies and the restoration of Roman Catholic breviaries, pontificals, and the like. The movement failed to wipe out anti-Catholic resistance to the

changes which were made. Incidents during the Marian rule made Roman Catholicism distasteful to most nationalistically minded Englishmen and indirectly helped to prepare the way for the re-establishment of the Protestant formularies in the next era. During the reign of Mary some influential Englishmen became more imbued with the ideas expressed by John Calvin, and they prepared themselves to further the cause of Calvinism in the next era.

The Elizabethan era saw a clash between the queen and the extremists among the Calvinists. The queen wanted the ancient rites and ceremonies of the English Church retained, while the opposing party wanted most of the ritual eliminated. A settlement was reached which satisfied most of the clergymen and the members of Parliament. The Puritans were never satisfied. A few years after the religious settlement, a Convocation of the English clergy adopted a confession of faith in which the Reformed view of the Lord's Supper was clearly taught. Calvinism thereby was reintroduced into the English Church.

The articles of faith and the prescribed forms of worship during the Reformation period were for the most part the work of one man, Thomas Cranmer. This archbishop of Canterbury relied heavily upon the confessions and orders of service which were in use in the Lutheran Church on the Continent. Some of the phrasing Cranmer used was taken word for word from those sources. Cranmer's successors recognized the work their predecessor had done, and with very few changes they incorporated his work into the Elizabethan formularies.

Cranmer's interpretation of the Lord's Supper posed a serious problem. Evidence would indicate that prior to and during the early part of 1548, Cranmer held to the doctrine of the Real Presence as taught in the Lutheran confessions. After that time Cranmer appears to have adopted the view of the mediating theologians. Because of the brevity of the formularies, it is difficult to be specific in identifying the view taught as being Lutheran or Calvinist, even though the composer's interpretation may be assumed.

Doctrinal information on the views of the continental reformers was taken from primary sources. Zwingli presented his interpretation in a treatise On the Lord's Supper which he published in 1525. The Lutheran view was found in the Augsburg Confession of 1530. John Calvin described his position on the Lord's Supper in his Institutes of the Christian Religion, the first edition of which was published in 1536.

The interpretation of the English divines was studied from collections of their sermons and writings. Some information was found in John Foxe's Acts and Monuments and in some of the works of John Strype. Correspondence between the English divines and the continental theologians was studied in the collection of such writings as found in the two volumes of the Original Letters from the archives of Zurich and in the first volume of the Zurich Letters.

The actual formularies were found in part in the Parker Society publications of The Two Liturgies, Liturgical Services, Private Prayers, and Nowell's Catechism. Other information

was found in Hardwick's History of the Articles of Religion, particularly in the appendices of that book. Lacey's edition of the King's Book was used for the views of Henry VIII, while information about the Bishops' Book was found in Hughes' Reformation in England. Cranmer's Catechism was found in one of the volumes of the Fathers of the English Church. The enabling legislation of Parliament and the Injunctions of the English monarchs were taken from Gee and Hardy's Documents.

CHAPTER I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER AS THE TOUCHSTONE FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF CALVINISM INTO THE FORMULARIES OF THE CHURCH

Two events took place in 1534 which initiated the introduction of Calvinism into England. The first happened in May in France when John Calvin resigned his clerical benefices and broke relations with the Roman Catholic Church.[1] The second occurred in November in England when Henry VIII was proclaimed the Supreme Head of the Church of England.[2] Both events led to Reformation movements which in the succeeding twenty-five years ran together and which have been inseparably linked ever since.

The two occurrences happened when far reaching changes were being made in the religious, social and political spheres. The monolithic structure of the Roman Catholic Church had been shattered by the Lutheran and the Helvetic Reformations. Demands for a national Reformation were heard in many parts of Europe. The inspiration for these movements came from those already successful.

Both events led to movements which built on the foundations others had laid. Calvin championed the ideas of others.

---

[1]John T. McNeill, "Introduction," Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion, in The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), XX, xxx.

[2]Henry Gee and William J. Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History Compiled from Original Sources (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), LV, 243-44.

"They cut the stones in the quarries, he polished them in the workshop."[3] Henry VIII's action led him and his successors to undergird the English Reformation with a theological basis. Part of that basis came from Calvinism.[4]

The two ties that England had with John Calvin were through his writings and through the personal contact some Englishmen had with the reformer when they were in Geneva, Calvin's stronghold. Almost from the moment that Calvin identified himself as an evangelical he began to write theological treatises. Of these, a nineteenth century authority says, "The literary activity of Calvin, whether we look at the number or at the importance of the works, is not surpassed by any ecclesiastical writer, ancient or modern."[5] His greatest work, one on which he labored from 1534 to 1559, was the Institutio Religionis Christianae. This was his definitive work. His other writings flowed into it or followed from it. It was intended by the author to serve as a textbook for candidates of theology and as a defense of Protestantism.[6] "This great treatise of Calvin is justly regarded as a

---

[3]Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church (Reproduction of the third edition, revised 1910; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's, n.d.), VIII, 258.

[4]Carl S. Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559 (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), pp. 149-67.

[5]Schaff, op. cit., VIII, 267.

[6]McNeill, "Introduction," Calvin: Institutes, XX, xxx-xxxiii.

classical statement of Protestant theology."[7] The first effort was expanded upon by the author in subsequent editions, until the final revision of 1559 covered the whole field of Christian theology. While the Geneva reformer worked on this treatise, English Church leaders became acquainted with his views and with those of his co-laborers. Some influential divines accepted some of these viewpoints and worked for their introduction into the theology of the Church of England.

Calvin's views on the Lord's Supper were of particular importance since this doctrine had long been in controversy in the Western Church and was one of the divisive doctrines during the Reformation period. An early work devoted to the Eucharist or specifically to the question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist was Paschasius Radbertus' treatise, The Lord's Body and Blood.[8] Written about 831, Radbertus held that the bread and the wine on the altar, after consecration by a priest, became the body and blood of Christ. Ratramnus of Corbie, who lived in the same city and wrote about the same time, disagreed with this view. In his book bearing a similar title Ratramnus taught that the elements did not change into the body and blood of Christ, but rather they were mystic symbols commemorating His death.[9] In 1050 a synod held at Vercelli

---

[7] Ibid., XX, xxx.

[8] "Paschasius Radbertus of Corbie: The Lord's Body and Blood (Selections)," Early Medieval Theology, edited by George E. McCracken in collaboration with Allen Cabaniss, in The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962), IX, 94-108.

[9] "Ratramnus of Corbie: Christ's Body and Blood," Early Medieval Theology, IX, 118-147.

under the leadership of Pope Leo IX condemned Ratramnus' view as heretical. The teaching of Radbertus became the dominant view of the Western Church. During the Reformation Era the controversy broke out anew. It not only split the Western Church, it also divided the Protestants into different camps. Calvinism, Lutheranism, and Zwinglianism held conflicting views. The introduction of Calvin's views on the Sacrament of the Altar indicates the influence he had on English theology.

Four views concerning the Lord's Supper were being advocated at the time of the introduction of Calvinism into England. Three of the interpretations were Protestant expressions, the other was Roman Catholic. One view was expressed by its proponent, Ulrich Zwingli, in a treatise On the Lord's Supper published in 1525. The Lutheran view was made public in the Augsburg Confession of 1530. A mediating view between the two Protestant positions was expressed in the Tigurine Confession of 1549. The Roman Catholic view was summarized in the Decrees of the Council of Trent, which began its sessions in 1545.

Protestants were unanimous in rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation advocated by the Roman Church. That view held that:

> After the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of sensible things.[10]

---

[10]"Decree Concerning the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist," Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, edited by H. J. Schroeder (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955), Session 13, 1, p. 73. Cited as Decrees.

The Roman Catholic Church also taught:

> That by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.[11]

The practice of communing only under one kind was maintained:

> Wherefore, it is very true that as much is contained under either form as under both. For Christ is whole and entire under the form of bread and any part of that form; likewise the whole Christ is present under the form of wine and all its parts.[12]

This view logically led to the elevation and veneration of the host and the elaborate ritual that went with it. Roman Catholics were taught:

> There is therefore no room for doubt that all the faithful of Christ may, in accordance with a custom received in the Catholic Church, give to this most holy sacrament in veneration the worship of latria, which is due to the true God.[13]

While the exact phrasing of the doctrine was not made until 1551, the interpretation as stated in the Decrees of the Council of Trent was substantially that of the Roman Church during the Reformation period. Disagreement with that view constituted heresy, and heresy in Catholic lands usually led to persecution.

The Swiss reformer Ulrich Zwingli attacked the Roman Catholic teaching. Zwingli held to a symbolic view of the

---

[11]"Transubstantiation," Decrees, Session 13, IV, p. 75.

[12]"The Excellence of the Most Holy Sacrament over the Other Sacraments," Decrees, Session 13, III, p. 74.

[13]"The Worship and Veneration To Be Shown to the Most Holy Sacrament," Decrees, Session 13, V, p. 76.

sacrament indicating that he considered the words of institution to be "an evident trope or metaphor."[14] He expressed his views in a treatise On the Lord's Supper. He wrote:

> A sacrament is the sign of a holy thing. When I say: The sacrament of the Lord's body, I am simply referring to that bread which is the symbol of the body of Christ who was put to death for our sakes. . . . But the very body of Christ is the body which is seated at the right hand of God, and the sacrament of his body is the bread, and the sacrament of his blood is the wine, of which we partake with thanksgiving. Now the sign and the thing signified cannot be one and the same thing. Therefore the sacrament of the body of Christ cannot be the body itself.[15]

The Zurich reformer also disagreed with the Lutherans of his day who held to the doctrine of the Real Presence. Zwingli insisted:

> But if we take the word "is" literally, . . . then necessarily the substance of bread has to be changed completely into that of flesh. But that means the bread is no longer there. Therefore it is impossible to maintain that the bread remains, but that in or under the bread flesh is eaten.[16]

The Lutheran view that Zwingli attacked was expressed in the Augsburg Confession of 1530. While denying transubstantiation, the Lutherans taught that Christ's body is given in, with, and under the bread. The Lutherans confessed this in Article X, saying:

> Of the Supper of the Lord they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to

---

[14]"On the Lord's Supper," Zwingli and Bullinger, Selected Translations with Introduction and Notes by G. W. Bromily, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), XXIV, 229.

[15]Ibid., XXIV, 188.

[16]Ibid., 191.

> those who eat in the Supper of the Lord; and they reject those that teach otherwise.[17]

The Lutheran confessors held with the other Protestants that communion should be given under both kinds. In Article XXII they confessed:

> To the laity are given Both Kinds in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper because this usage has the commandment of the Lord in Matt. 26, 27: Drink ye all of it, where Christ has manifestly commanded concerning the cup that all should drink.[18]

The third Protestant interpretation was a middle position between Luther's view and that of Zwingli. This interpretation sought to make of the sacrament more than an empty symbol and yet it tried to avoid any concept of transubstantiation or consubstantiation. This was the view espoused by Martin Bucer of Strassburg, "the great compromise theologian,"[19] and by Henry Bullinger, Zwingli's successor at Zurich. Both theologians had important contacts with English divines. Bullinger's views were brought into focus with the view held by John Calvin in the Consensus Tigurinus of 1549.[20] The latter document arose from the demands of the Council of Berne to force all pastors in the area to agree on a common view of the sacrament. Since Calvin had many adherents in Berne, meetings were arranged between Bullinger and Calvin, and the agreement was reached.

---

[17]"The Augsburg Confession," Triglot Concordia (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 47.

[18]Ibid., p. 59.

[19]Reinhold Seeberg, Textbook of the History of Doctrine, translated by Charles E. Hay (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952), II, 390.

[20]Ibid., II, 417.

Calvin taught this view in the Institutes. Calvin wrote:

> . . . our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ in the same way that bread and wine keep and sustain physical life. For the analogy of the sign applies only if souls find their nourishment in Christ--which cannot happen unless Christ truly grows into one with us, and refreshes us by the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood.
>
> Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ's flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his unmeasureableness by our measure. What, then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive; that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.[21]

Calvin's view on the question whether unworthy communicants receive the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper is also important. Lutherans taught that they did. Calvin held that they did not. He wrote:

> Yet Christ's flesh itself in the mystery of the Supper is a thing no less spiritual than our eternal salvation. From this we infer that all those who are devoid of Christ's Spirit can no more eat Christ's flesh than drink wine that has no taste. Surely, Christ is too unworthily torn apart if his body, lifeless and powerless, is prostituted to unbelievers.[22]

The introduction of this view into the formularies of the Church of England would indicate the introduction of Calvinism.

Concern over ceremonies and rites also found expression in the English Reformation period. Zwinglians held to an "extreme simplification of the rule of Scripture."[23] They stripped the worship services of medieval ceremonial and

---

[21] Calvin: Institutes, IV.17.10. XXI, 1370.

[22] Ibid., IV.17.33. XXI, 1406.

[23] John T. McNeill, The History and Character of Calvinism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 84.

interpretation. "Invocation and adoration of the Virgin and saints, pilgrimages, indulgences, images, instrumental music, and much of the traditional material of public prayer were swept away."[24] Zwinglians in England, as the thesis will show, sought to achieve in their homeland what had been done in the Swiss cities. Calvin adopted a somewhat modified view of the question of ceremonies. He wrote:

> Further, we must strive with the greatest diligence to prevent error from creeping in, either to corrupt or to obscure this pure use. This end will be attained if all observances, whatever they shall be, display manifest usefulness and if very few are allowed; . . . Secondly, that we occupy ourselves without superstition in the observance of those things and not require it too fastidiously of others, that we may not feel the worship of God to be the better for a multitude of ceremonies; and that one church may not despise another because of diversity of outward discipline. Finally, that . . . if the church requires it we may not only without any offense allow something to be changed but permit any observances previously in use among us to be abandoned. This present age offers proof of that fact that it may be a fitting thing to set aside, as may be opportune in the circumstances, certain rites that in other circumstances are not impious or indecorous.[25]

As the theology of the English Church changed, some English divines remained Zwinglian in the matter of ceremonies. Other religious leaders tolerated the use of rites. Doctrinally it was possible for English Calvinists to agree on interpretation of Scripture and at the same time to disagree on the matter of ceremonies. Other English leaders followed a Lutheran tradition retaining those ceremonies which did not violate the Lutheran Confessions. This thesis will show that

---

[24] Ibid., pp. 84-5.

[25] Calvin: Institutes, IV.10.32. XXI, 1210.

leaders of the English Church were divided on the question. This matter was not considered divisive during the period studied.

In addition to their reading of Reformed theology, some Englishmen also came into direct contact with the practices of the Reformed Church while they were on the Continent. This was particularly true of the Marian exiles who found a refuge in Geneva. By the time they started to arrive in 1553 that city had already become a "city of saints."[26] There the English observed and lived under a theocracy, a city regulated by Church ordinances.[27] Geneva's rule extended into the countryside, and articles had been drawn up to rule the rural area in the same fashion.[28] While this system had driven out some dissenters, it also had attracted a large number of émigrés. Nearly six thousand religious refugees had found a haven in the Swiss city.[29] It would be natural for such exiles to try to effect a similar rule and the same theology when they returned to their homelands.

These contacts some English divines had with John Calvin must be considered in a treatment of the introduction of

---

[26]Roland Bainton, The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952), p. 121.

[27]"Draft Ecclesiastical Ordinances September & October 1541," Calvin: Theological Treatises, edited by J. K. S. Reid, in The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), XXII, 58-72.

[28]"The Ordinances for the Supervision of Churches in the Country," Calvin: Theological Treatises, XXII, 76-82.

[29]Bainton, op. cit., p. 121.

Calvinism into the formularies of the English Church. Earlier contacts the English had with men who taught Reformed theology must also be considered, since Calvinism absorbed the Reformed tradition. Work done by those men might be called preparatory for the introduction of Calvinism. The word Calvinist, itself, does not appear in printed English until 1579. The word Calvinian was used earlier in 1566 and the term Calvinism began to be used in 1570. Prior to that time references to the doctrines of the Swiss Reformed Churches were termed Helvetic or Zwinglian. Most of what "was embraced by the word 'Calvinism' had been introduced to the English mind through the influence of Bucer and Bullinger."[30] The contribution of others, such as Peter Martyr Vermigli and John à Lasco, led in the same direction. These men were not Calvin's "rivals but his heralds."[31]

John Calvin took an active interest in English affairs, although he never visited the country. Correspondents kept him informed on the affairs of the English Church and the state. His concern was indicated by the dedication of some of his treatises to English leaders. In 1550 he dedicated his Commentary on Isaiah to Edward VI. The revision of this same work he dedicated to Elizabeth I. His Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles was dedicated to the Duke of Somerset on its publication in 1556. Earlier he had addressed his Commentary on the Catholic Epistles to the young English

---

[30] McNeill, The History and Character of Calvinism, p. 309.

[31] Ibid., p. 310.

king in 1551. Calvin's aid was moreover sought by Thomas Cranmer, the primate of England from 1533 to 1553, when he sought to call a conclave of theologians to counter the meeting of the Roman Catholic leaders who were meeting in Trent.

English law demanded religious uniformity and conformity of its citizens and its leaders. Independent churches and independent beliefs were not tolerated, nor were they sought by the reformers. Such toleration might be extended at times to foreign refugees, but the people of the realm were expected to conform or face the consequences. Therefore:

> The English Reformation must be properly defined as a readjustment of the constitutional, doctrinal and ritual system of the Church of England. The idea that it was the foundation of a new Church, or that it was intended to be by the reformers is wholly unjustified by history and may be dismissed as an absurd error.[32]

It is within this frame of reference that the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England is considered. The extent to which Calvinism succeeded in introducing its teachings on the Lord's Supper into the articles of faith and into the forms of worship makes the topic germane.

---

[32]Thomas Short, The History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688 (Philadelphia: James Campbell and Co., 1843), p. 7.

CHAPTER II

THE HENRICIAN REFORMATION AND THE FIRST PROTESTANT FORMULARIES

While John Calvin was beginning to publish his theological treatises, the Henrician Reformation was likewise beginning. In November 1534 Parliament passed an Act of Supremacy declaring the English king to be the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England.[1] The Henrician Reformation provided part of the necessary background for the later introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the established Church. The immediate cause for Parliament's action was the refusal of Pope Clement VII to grant Henry VIII an annulment from his wife, Catherine of Aragon. The stated reason for the step taken was the contention that the English Church was sovereign. This principle has been stated thus:

> A national Church, through the medium of its representative synod, duly convened with royal sanction, has inherent authority from its Divine Founder to remove any species of abuse, whether of doctrine or discipline, existing within its jurisdiction; nay, is absolutely bound by its allegiance to Christ and its regard for its people committed to its charge, to vindicate and extend the truths of the Gospel, as once for all delivered to the saints and taught in the Early Church.[2]

The Henrician Reformation revolved around the decisions of one man, Henry VIII (1509-1547), and the influence his

---

[1]Henry Gee and William J. Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History compiled from Original Sources (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), no. LV, pp. 243-44. Cited as Documents.

[2]Charles Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion To Which Is Appended A Series of Documents, From A.D. 1536 To A.D. 1615; Together With Illustrations From Contemporary Sources (London: George Bell and Son, 1881), p. 24.

primate, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer (1533-1553), exerted on the king. The important documents of the era are those authored or approved by these two men and include: The Ten Articles of 1536, properly titled Articles Devised By The Kinges Highes Majestie, To Stablyshe Christen Quietness And Unitie Amonge Us And To Avoyde Contentious Opinions, Which Articles Be Also Approved By The Consent And Determination Of The Hole Clergie Of This Realme,[3] and the Thirteen Articles of 1538, which is officially and properly titled A Book Containing Divers Articles, De Unitate, Dei Et Trinitate Personarum, De Peccato Originali, &c.[4] The two important books of the period were The Bishops' Book of 1537 and The King's Book of 1543. The first was authorized by Cranmer and is properly titled The godly and pious Institution of a Christian Man. The second is attributed to the king and bears the proper title A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man; set forth by the King's Majesty of England. A deeper insight into the king's thinking is found in the repressive articles of 1539, The Six Articles Act.[5]

Legislation passed by Parliament and describing the implications of the action taken are found in the following statutes: The Annates Act of 1532, the Statute of Appeals of 1533, the Ecclesiastical Appointments Act, the Dispensations Act, the Submission of the Clergy Act, the Heresy Act,

---

[3] Ibid., Appendix No. I, pp. 221-236.

[4] Ibid., Appendix No. II, pp. 237-250.

[5] Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 303-19.

the Act of Supremacy, the Succession Act, a second Succession Act, and the Treason Act of 1534. In 1536 Parliament passed legislation for the Suppression of the Lesser Monasteries.[6]

The pressure Henry VIII applied to force Pope Clement VII to grant an annulment to Catherine of Aragon and the counter pressure Emperor Charles V used to protect his aunt were important factors that led to the open break of the Church of England with Rome. Henry's threat in 1529 to join the Lutherans, his intimidation of the English clergy in 1531, and the financial pressure which the Annates Act of 1532 supplied led finally to legislation which denied papal jurisdiction over the English Church. The Appeals Act of 1533 forced all decisions to be resolved by the English Church, and indirectly the legislation removed Henry's case from a papal ruling.

In the question of securing an annulment Henry acted upon the advice given to him by Thomas Cromwell, later his secretary and the vice-regent for ecclesiastical affairs. Henry also followed the opinion of Thomas Cranmer, later his archbishop of Canterbury. Both men advised the king to submit the case to an English court.[7] Shortly after Cranmer

---

[6] Ibid., the Annates Act, no. XLIX, pp. 178-86; the Statutes of Appeals, no. L, pp. 187-95; the Ecclesiastical Appointments Act, no. LII, pp. 201-09; the Dispensations Act, no. LIII, pp. 209-32; the Submission of the Clergy Act, no. LI, pp. 196-98; the Heresy Act, no. XLII, pp. 133-37; the Act of Supremacy, no. LV, pp. 243-44; the Succession Act, no. LVI, pp. 144-47; the Treason Act, no. LVII, pp. 247-51; the Suppression of the Lesser Monastaries, pp. 257-68.

[7] Harold J. Grimm, The Reformation Era, 1500-1650 (New York: Macmillan Co., 1954), p. 295.

was consecrated in his new office, the case was heard and the ruling was made (1533) that Henry's marriage was contrary to divine law.[8]

Henry's Reformation Parliament made the break final and legal in 1534. The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act removed papal jurisdiction in the appointment of bishops. The Dispensations Act provided Parliament with the right to dispense with papal laws. The Submission of the Clergy Act legalized the earlier acknowledgment by the clergy that the king was the final arbiter in religious matters. A Heresy Act resolved the dilemma of making it an act of heresy to name anyone but the pope the head of the Church. The Supremacy Act established the king as the supreme head of the English Church and described his legal rights in the direction of the Church and of its teachings. The two Succession Acts established the line of succession to the English throne through the children of Anne Boleyn, Henry's second wife, and removed Mary, the daughter of Catherine, from immediate succession. A Treason Act made it treasonable to deny any of the king's titles including the recently acquired one as the head of the Church.

While such legislation established a national church dominated, directed, and controlled by the English king; the statutes are Reformation acts only in the sense that they severed the tie of the English Church with Rome. The legis-

---

[8]Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (London: Hollis and Carter, 1956), I, 244.

lation did not set aside other teachings nor did it change the practices of the Church in its worship. Provision for such changes was made, providing that it had the king's direction and sanction.

Pressure to change the theological basis of the Church and its ceremonies had long existed in England. As early as the fourteenth century John Wyclif had called for drastic changes. His followers, the Lollards, continued the agitation into the sixteenth century. Serious efforts were made to wipe out the movement. In the episcopal sees of London and Lincoln between 1510 and 1521 nearly five hundred Englishmen were accused of Lollardy. Twenty of that number were burned at the stake.[9]

Some Englishmen were encouraged by the successes of Reformation movements on the Continent. They smuggled theological writings into England. Study cells to read and discuss such literature existed at Cambridge University. Attempts were made to suppress the reading of these treatises. On 12 May 1521 the papal order to burn Luther's writings was carried out also in England.[10] The burning was considered so important that it attracted the papal legate, Cardinal Wolsey, the papal nuncio, the imperial ambassador, and all the English bishops. The leader in this "war of books" was the king himself.[11] Henry VIII sought to answer

---

[9]A. G. Dickens, Lollards And Protestants in the Diocese of York, 1509-1558 (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 8.

[10]Carl S. Meyer, "Henry VIII Burns Luther's Books," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, IX (October 1959), 173-87.

[11]Hughes, op. cit., I, 146-48.

Luther's treatise The Babylonian Captivity of the Church with his own book, Assertio Septem Sacramentorum. Published in July 1521 Henry's book won Leo X's praise and the title for himself and his successors, "Defender of the Faith." The king's position and the burning of Luther's books did not stop the importation of such writings from the Continent. In addition to Luther's works, those of Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bugenhagen, Bucer, Melanchthon and other reformers entered England in the years of suppression.

Attempts to halt the movement were made by means of additional persecutions. The inquisition authorized by the bishop of London between 1527 and 1532 convicted two hundred and eighteen of holding and spreading evangelical ideas. While most of those convicted were Lollards, this six-year persecution caught up in its net men who were advocating and teaching ideas introduced by the German and the Swiss reformers. It is significant that more of the accused in the persecutions came from the professional class than was the case in earlier inquisitions. Some were merchants, others were book sellers, and some were teachers. Of particular importance is the fact that twenty-one of the convicted men, about ten per cent of the total, were priests. Some of these priests were men in high places in the regular clergy. In all England during this inquisition eleven died at the stake. One of these eleven was a priest, Thomas Bilney.

Bilney greatly influenced Robert Barnes, England's

Lutheran leader during the thirties,[12] and Hugh Latimer, a Henrician bishop who died a Marian martyr. Barnes was a member of the English Commission that met with the Lutheran theologians at the time when Henry was interested in an alliance with the German princes. Latimer was a bishop who held to a Calvin's view of the Sacrament of the Altar during Edward VI's reign (1547-1553).

The war of books brought a native-born Englishman upon the religious scene. William Tyndale was the first Englishman to publish writings of religious consequence during this era. Tyndale was determined to publish an English Bible translation which "even a plowboy could understand."[13] Unable to do so in England, Tyndale went to the Continent. His New Testament was printed during the winter of 1525 and 1526 and shortly thereafter entered England. On 23 October 1526 Tunstall, then bishop of London, banned the translation. Tyndale was not deterred. His translation of the Pentateuch appeared in 1530, the Book of Jonah in 1531, and his revised New Testament in 1534.

Tyndale's other works included: The Parable of the Wicked Mammon in 1526, The Obedience of a Christian Man and how Christian Rulers Ought to Govern in 1528, and The Practice of Prelates in 1530. Sections of Tyndale's works were taken

---

[12]Neelak S. Tjernagel, Dr. Robert Barnes and Anglo-Lutheran Relations, 1521-1540. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955.

[13]M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism: A Chapter in the History of Idealism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 7.

directly from Luther's publications.[14] One historian comments that Tyndale "used Luther rather than agreed with Luther."[15] This is possible since Tyndale held to a covenant relationship between God and man, an idea taught by the Swiss reformers rather than by Luther. Tyndale's attitude toward Church ritual has earned him the title of the "First English Puritan."[16]

Tyndale's attacks upon the theology and the practices of the English Church encouraged others of similar persuasion to join in the theological war of books. Among those entering the fray were William Roy, John Frith, William Barlow, George Joye, and Simon Fish. The total effect of their writings was a sustained attack upon the teachings and leadership of the established Church. Some of these men, like John Frith, followed their leader William Tyndale into martyrdom rather than deny their beliefs.[17]

An important change took place in the leadership of the Church in the years 1534 to 1536. During this period Henry appointed bishops, who as students had studied the theology of the Swiss and German reformers. Five of the seven appointees were Cambridge men: Thomas Goodrich, Nicholas Shaxton,

---

[14]E. G. Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII) (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1947), pp. 49-51.

[15]L. J. Trinterud, "A Reappraisal of William Tyndale's Debt to Martin Luther," Church History, XXI (March 1962), 24-45.

[16]M. M. Knappen, "William Tyndale--First English Puritan," Church History, V (September 1936), 201-215.

[17]Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 21-30.

Hugh Latimer, John Salcot or Capon, and Edward Foxe. John Hilsey, another appointee, had also been influenced by the continental theologians. Led by Thomas Cranmer, these bishops attempted to change the formularies of the Church.[18]

Attacks upon the teachings of the Church of England intensified as Henry VIII established a national Church in the period after 1529. The confusion among the people became so great that on Pentecost Day 1534 Archbishop Cranmer forbade all preaching on controversial topics until the religious issue was resolved. This ban was in effect until 1536 when the first Protestant formulary was issued. The ban on preaching was an important first step in that direction; for while it kept the attackers from speaking out, it also silenced the defenders of the teachings of the English Church.[19]

Another form of Protestantism was cheered when Henry VIII made overtures to the Lutheran princes of Germany to join the Schmalkaldic League. The insistence that the English Church subscribe to the Augsburg Confession as a condition of the alliance led the king to send an English delegation of theologians to Wittenberg. This delegation included Barnes, Heath and Fox. They met with a German delegation which included Luther and Melanchthon. Henry VIII appears to have been particularly enamoured with Philip Melanchthon since in 1534 he invited the Lutheran leader to assist in a

---

[18]Hughes, op. cit., I, 346-47.

[19]Jasper Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 92.

reformation of the English Church.[20] In the winter of 1535 and 1536 the German delegation drew up Articles of Faith to which Henry did not agree. The chief obstacles to agreement were the Lutheran demands for the abolition of private masses and the relaxation of clerical celibacy.[21]

While these negotiations hinted at a change in the formularies of the English Church, Cranmer called a Convocation of the clergy to effect such a change. The meetings began 9 June 1536 and from them emerged a series of articles changing the theology of the Church. The keynote address for the meeting was given by Cromwell, who, speaking for the king, called upon the clergymen to "set a quietness in the Churche" and "to conclude all thinges by the Word of God, without all brawling or scolding."[22]

The house of bishops failed to abide by the king's admonition. Reports of their sessions indicate that they debated hotly on the question of changing the Church's confessions. The newly appointed bishops wanted them changed, while the earlier appointees demanded the status quo.[23]

While the upper house was thus engaged, the lower house busied itself, drawing up a long list of propositions said to have been taught by some people. The sixty-seven propositions have been judged to be "a strange mixture of evangelical

---

[20]Tjernagel, op. cit., p. 66.

[21]Ibid., p. 69.

[22]Hardwick, op. cit., p. 52.

[23]Ibid., pp. 52-54.

statements with exaggerations and fanatical extravagances."[24] One historian has correlated the condemned propositions with a longer list of two hundred and fifty-one sentences the king had condemned on 24 May 1530.[25] Included in the list were some to which Englishmen later subscribed, such as the proposition that communion should be distributed under both kinds.

Since the original records of the meetings have been lost, the exact process by which the clergymen acted upon the articles of faith that came from the sessions is unknown. Hardwick suggested that:

> It is probable that the contest was in both houses followed by a considerable compromise of opinions, and that the "Ten Articles about Religion" . . . were the immediate result of this mutual concession.[26]

This new formulary was issued as Articles Devised By The Kinges Highes Majestie, To Stablyshe Christen Quietness And Unitie Amonge Us, And To Avoyde Contentious Opinions, Which Articles Be Also Approved By The Consent And Determination Of The Hole Clergie Of This Realme.[27] The Preface to the confession was written by the king as the head of the Church and indicates that the formulary was issued by his authority. The Ten Articles were a Protestant expression of faith for the most part, and it provides some of the later background for the

---

[24]Henry E. Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Henry VIII, and Edward VI, and Its Literary Monuments: A Study in Comparative Symbolics (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1916), p. 83.

[25]Hughes, op. cit., II, 331-46, Appendix I.

[26]Hardwick, op. cit., p. 54.

[27]Ibid., pp. 222-36, Appendix No. I.

introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England.

The confession is divided into two main sections; the first contains five articles under the general heading "The principal articles concerning our Faith"; the second section deals with "Articles Concerning The Laudable Ceremonies of The Church." The first article established the Bible and the three ecumenical creeds as interpreted by the "holy approved doctors of the Church" as the basis upon which all teachings must be grounded. Article II treats of Baptism and ends with the statement that "we, being justified by His grace, should be made the inheritors of everlasting life, according to our hope." The third article calls penance a sacrament and contains a statement that by faith "God will forgive the truly penitent his sins, and repute him justified . . . not for the worthiness of any merit or work done by the penitent, but only for the merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Article IV treats of the Sacrament of the Altar and states "that under the same form of bread and wine the very selfsame body and blood of Christ is corporally, really, and in the very substance exhibited, distributed, and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament." The fifth article deals with justification and interprets the term to mean the "remission of our sins, and our acceptance or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God, that is to say, our perfect renovation in Christ." Article VI states that images have a proper part to play in a church but that

they are not to be the objects of worship. Article VII "Of honouring of Saints" and Article VII "Of praying to Saints" declare that saints are to be honored. Christians, the articles state, may pray to the saints to be their intercessors "for us and with us to the Father," but the articles caution that such prayers must be said without "any vain superstition, as to think that any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any saint doth serve for one thing more than another, or is patron of the same." Article IX "Of Rites and Ceremonies" permits the use of the ancient customs of the Church as to vestments, the use of holy water, the use of candles, and the like. Article X "Of Purgatory" deals guardedly with the subject indicating that such a place may exist. Prayers for the dead are deemed proper. The last article denies that the bishop of Rome has power from God to release men from purgatory.[28]

A comparison of the Ten Articles with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the same and the writings of Melanchthon shows its dependence in part on the Lutheran Confessions.[29] It has been suggested that Cranmer, Fox, Latimer and perhaps others of the bishops subscribed to the articles not because they agreed with everything they contained, but because they felt that they could demand no more at the time.[30]

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] Jacobs, op. cit., p. 95.

[30] Ibid., p. 97.

The brevity of the articles and the omission of some of the controversial topics of the time left the interpreter a great deal of latitude. While a Roman Catholic Cardinal, Reginald Pole, could find "little fault with the articles,"[31] either the clergy of the North with few exceptions refused to subscribe to them or else they were absent. Their signatures are not on the document.[32] A revolution broke out in Lincoln about the time the articles started to circulate. The rebels defended their action on the grounds that they were opposed to the changes which they said some of the bishops were foisting on the Church. Henry VIII then issued The First Royal Injunctions of 1536 to force subscription to the Ten Articles.[33] The minutes of the meeting of the clergy which approved the confession were circulated to prove that the changes had their approval, and that the confession was not the decision of a few of the Church leaders.

This confession of 1536 is a high point in the Henrician Reformation. It was issued in the king's name, and it had his approval. The Ten Articles indicated the influence Protestants had on an official formulary of the Church of England. The dependency of the articles in part on the Lutheran Confessions and John Calvin's dependency upon the

---

[31]Frederick J. Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation (London: James Clarke and Co., n.d.), p. 19.

[32]Hardwick, op. cit., p. 63.

[33]Gee and Hardy, Documents, p. 302.

Lutheran Reformation provide a connecting link in the later introduction of Calvinism into the English formularies.

The second important document of the day did not bear the king's stamp of approval. It was a publication by the English bishops. It became known as the Bishops' Book and bore the title: The godly and pious Institution of a Christian Man. The sub-title was The Exposition or Interpretation of the Common Creed, of the Seven Sacraments, of the Ten Commandments, and of the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria, Justification and Purgatory. Published in 1537, the Bishops' Book superseded the Ten Articles as the formulary of the day.

It was another basis on which Calvinism later built. The book was the work of a commission appointed by Cranmer to give a theological basis to the national Church. Its chief editor was Bishop Fox, one of the commissioners who met with the Lutherans in Wittenberg in 1536. Fox has been called "the most perfect Lutheran in England of that time."[34] Parts of the Bishops' Book are paraphrases of Luther's Catechisms, the Lutheran Confessions, and the Ten Articles. Unlike the latter, however, the Bishops' Book speaks of the traditional seven sacraments of the Roman Church, whereas the Ten Articles mention only three. A distinction is made between the sacraments. Those mentioned in the Ten Articles are said to have Christ's institution behind them, while the

---

[34]Jacobs, op. cit., p. 105. The characterization, however, may belong to Robert Barnes rather than Fox.

other four mentioned had their common origin in the Church. The Bishops' Book contains only one page dealing with the Lord's Supper, the sacrament around which much of the controversy of that day and later days revolved. The teaching of the Ten Articles on the sacrament was retained. The formulary taught that the communicant receives under the form of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. The Lutheran teaching of the Real Presence appears to be maintained, while the Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation and the Zwinglian view of representation appear to be denied.[35]

The Ten Articles and the Bishops' Book established the framework within which the theology of the Church of England was changed. Within this framework permission was also granted for an authorized version of the Bible. A royal injunction issued in 1536 commanded that an English Bible be made available for use in the churches of the land.[36] Thomas Cromwell persuaded the king to authorize the Matthew Bible as the official version. This Bible was the work of John Rogers and was based upon the earlier translations of William Tyndale and Miles Coverdale.[37]

While the Matthew Bible became the official version of the Scriptures, Tyndale's earlier translation continued to be popular among the people. Fifty thousand copies of his New

---

[35]Hughes, op. cit., II, 39-40.

[36]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXIII, pp. 275-81.

[37]J. F. Mozley, Coverdale and His Bibles (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), pp. 125-78.

Testament were printed during the period from 1526 to 1536. Considering the population of England of that era, Tyndale's version had a wide appeal.

The order to place a Bible in all of the parish churches came at a time "when at last the whole population was aware that all of the religion of the past was now in the melting pot."[38] The English Church had been separated from Rome, the theology of the Church had been changed, the lesser monasteries which had been a source of strength for Roman Catholicism had been suppressed, men had been made bishops who a few years earlier would have been condemned as heretics, and Englishmen had Bible versions to turn to for their source of doctrine. What had been banned ten years earlier was promoted in 1536. The Bible versions, moreover, contained notes and introductions which drove home to the reader the ideas advocated by evangelicals.

In 1538 appeared the next formulary of faith, the popularly called Thirteen Articles. The document bore the title A Book Containing Divers Articles, De Unitate Dei Et Trinitate Personarum, De Peccato Originali, &c.[39] This confession grew out of the political situation of the day. Henry VIII once again turned to the Lutheran princes of Germany for a political alliance. The confession is in Latin, from which it has been deduced that the articles were drawn up by both the

---

[38]Hughes, op. cit., II, 58.

[39]Hardwick, op. cit., Appendix No. II, pp. 237-50.

English and the German divines.[40] The Lutheran delegation headed by Francis Burckhardt, George à Boynesburg and Frederic Myconius arrived in England in May 1538 and remained until the first part of September. The joint committee of German and English theologians arrived at thirteen articles on which they agreed. No agreement was reached or there was evident disagreement over some other points the Lutherans wanted to include in a joint confession.

A comparison of the Thirteen Articles with the Augsburg Confession shows the dependency of the English formulary upon the earlier Lutheran confession.[41] The brevity of some of the articles indicates, however, that the commissioners appear to have had trouble agreeing on other points of doctrine beyond those stated. The seventh article, for example, which deals with the Lord's Supper, has but two sentences. The article teaches that under the species of bread and wine the body and blood of Christ are truly, substantially and actually present and are so received by the communicant. Some receive the sacrament to their damnation, others receive it to their salvation.[42] Nothing is said beyond this.

About the same time that the Lutheran commissioners left for their homeland, Henry VIII issued royal injunctions (5 September 1538) which underscored some of the changes that

---

[40] Ibid., p. 73.

[41] Ibid., pp. 239-46.

[42] Ibid., p. 242.

had been made in the Church of England. The injunctions called on the clergy to encourage Bible reading among the laity. They warned against superstitious practices in the Church and the keeping of man-made laws. The orders abolished the service known as the Angelus for devotion purposes, and they hinted that praying to the saints was useless.[43]

Shortly after the Thirteen Articles were drawn up, either Henry VIII became alarmed at the reaction of many of his subjects to the changes which were made in the thought and practices of the Church,[44] or he fell under the influence of some of the Church leaders who wanted no further changes made.[45] Hardly had the Lutheran delegation left England, when the king personally presided at the trial of a priest, John Lambert. Lambert was eventually condemned to death for his denial of transubstantiation.

In the beginning of 1539 Henry VIII again played up to the Lutheran princes of Germany, and he invited another delegation of theologians to meet in England to discuss religious matters. When the felt danger against England disappeared, the king called off the negotiations and abruptly sent the German delegation home. The Lutherans stayed long enough to see the introduction of the repressive Act of the Six Articles

---

[43] Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXIII, pp. 275-81.

[44] Hughes, op. cit., I, 296-320.

[45] Hardwick, op. cit., p. 72.

in Parliament.[46]

The Act of the Six Articles probably reflected Henry VIII's true religious sympathies. The first article upheld the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. The second article denied that the laity should receive the cup, maintaining that the blood of Christ was present with His flesh. The third article forbade ordained priests to marry, while the following article forbade the breaking of vows of chastity or the vows of widowhood. Private masses were to be continued according to the fifth article. The last article maintained the necessity of auricular confession.

Added to the doctrinal section were the provisions for the traditional punishment to be meted out to anyone who published, preached, taught or said anything contrary to the doctrine of transubstantiation. The provisions warned that on conviction offenders would "suffer . . . pains of death by burning."[47]

The Act of the Six Articles was a setback for the reformers. The Lutheran leaders in Germany were dismayed by the action taken. Melanchthon wrote to Henry VIII expressing his surprise at the turn of events. Two of the English bishops, Latimer and Shaxton, resigned from their office rather than be forced to carry out the provisions of the act. Cromwell was put to death in 1540 for the stated reason that he had violated the act. Other martyrs of the era included

---

[46]Gee and Hardy, Documents, pp. 303-19.

[47]Ibid., p. 307.

Robert Barnes, William Jerome, and Cranmer's personal chaplain, Thomas Garret.

The change in the theological climate was also indicated by the authorization of a different version of the Bible. The council voted to replace The Matthew Bible with The Great Bible, and in April 1539 the new version appeared. All annotations in the text were deleted, "and so on every page the beautiful drawn 'hands' do no more than point to the places where the Lutheran notes were meant to go."[48]

The last of the important religious documents of the era was the King's Book, properly titled A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.[49] This book is said to have been the king's personal revision of the Bishops' Book published six years earlier. Henry had indicated his dissatisfaction with the bishops' publication and suggested that the text be changed. He submitted two hundred and fifty revisions of the text to his primate for criticism. Cranmer's Annotations[50] indicate the disagreement between the two leaders. Cranmer refused to go along with eighty-two of the changes the king wanted made.

A careful analysis of the book based on the differences

---

[48]Hughes, op. cit., II, 59.

[49]The King's Book Or, A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1543 With an Introduction by T. A. Lacey (London: S.P.C.K., 1932).

[50]Thomas Cranmer, "Annotations," Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, edited for The Parker Society by John Cox (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1846), II, 83-114.

between the Bishops' Book and the King's Book points out some fundamental changes made by the king, particularly in the doctrine of justification.[51] The Lutheran teaching that man is saved sola fide is denied, and fides caritate formata is set forth as the key to salvation.[52] The king also upheld the Roman Catholic doctrine that communion under one species is proper. Unlike the Bishops' Book which had been licensed for only three years and which never had the sanction of the king, the King's Book by statute was made the standard of belief.

While the king was moving in this direction, Thomas Cranmer was moving in the opposite direction. Cranmer transformed his own diocese of Canterbury so that it "became dangerous for preachers to approve Catholic doctrines and practices which were still allowed and recommended by the official directions of the king."[53] Cranmer ordered the destruction of images in the churches of his diocese, appointed Protestant preachers to his cathedral staff, announced that the Bishops' Book had never really had his approval, permitted John Scory to preach justification by faith and to say that the Lord's Supper is only a sacrifice of praise, and reportedly permitted Lancelot Ridley to say that it was a waste of time to pray for the souls of the dead.[54] In 1543 the archbishop fell

---

[51] Hughes, op. cit., II, 46-57.

[52] The King's Book, pp. 9-13.

[53] Hughes, op. cit., II, 13.

[54] Ibid., II, 16.

under the suspicion of heresy. Henry VIII went to the defense of the primate and permitted the accused, Cranmer, to accuse his accusers.[55]

Others were accused of heresy during the same year. Some were accused of protecting and sheltering a heretic or of possessing illegal theological books. Among the accused was John Marbeck, a musician and at the time an organist in the royal chapel. Marbeck was charged with having in his possession extracts from the writings of John Calvin.[56] The accusation would indicate that the writings of the Geneva reformer were finding their way into England and were being read.

During the last years of his reign Henry VIII chose the regents to rule England during the minority of his son, Edward VI. Sixteen men were appointed to run the affairs of state until his heir was eighteen years old. Three were churchmen, two were chief justices, while the others were peers of the realm or held important posts in the state. The chief clergymen were Thomas Cranmer and Cuthbert Tunstall, the bishop of Durham since 1522. Supporters of Cranmer were Seymour, the Earl of Hertford, John Russel, John Dudley, Sir Anthony Denny and Sir William Herbert. Supporters of Tunstall were Wriothesley, the Lord Chancellor, Sir Anthony Brown, and the two brothers Wotton. Others appear to have had no strong religious views or seldom attended the meetings. Henry's choice

---

[55]Ridley, op. cit., pp. 236-38.

[56]James Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century (London: Macmillan And Co., 1904), p. 227.

of regents tipped the balance toward those who had benefited from the changes made in the management of the Church of England.[57]

Henry VIII died 28 January 1547. As far as Rome was concerned he died a schismatic. The will he left indicated that he retained many of the teachings of Rome. In it he made his prayer to the saints, and he requested that a daily mass be said in perpetuum for his soul.[58] Concerning his beliefs during his last years a Roman Catholic historian writes:

> Henry VIII never, in those last years of his reign, came to show any degree of affection for Lollard or Lutheran beliefs. The touchstone of religious orthodoxy continued to be the acknowledgement of the Royal Supremacy and the observance of the Six Articles Act.[59]

The Henrician Reformation came to an end with the death of the king, but its ramifications continued into the next era. Henry VIII had established a national Church, and the principle had been adopted that the monarch was the final arbiter in religious matters. The king had personally assumed the direction of the English Church, and he had forced submission to his will in religious matters. His successor was a nine-year old boy, who obviously could not manage the Church as his father had done. Some of the leaders Henry had placed

---

[57]A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603), Vol. VI The Political History of England, ed. by William Hunt and Reginald Poole (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), p. 3.

[58]Peter Heylyn, Ecclesia Restaurata (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1849), pp. 47-9.

[59]Hughes, op. cit., II, 11.

into office were men with strong Protestant leanings. Henry held these men in check. His young son would have had difficulty doing the same thing, even had he wanted to do so.

The English Church had been exposed to and had accepted some of the doctrines taught in the Lutheran churches of Germany. English theologians and German divines had met for theological conferences. In 1536 they had agreed on a confession of faith, which the English Church accepted as its own basis of belief. Whereas subsequent meetings did not have the same results, the contacts the divines had with each other had important consequences for subsequent era.

Henry's conduct in the political realm eventually led the Lutheran leaders of Germany to distrust the English king. Henry played up to the German princes as long as it was to his advantage to do so. He acquiesced to their demands that there be doctrinal agreement as a condition for an alliance. He permitted his divines to meet with the Lutheran theologians to see if they could work out a mutually acceptable statement of belief. When the English king felt that it was not to his advantage to have an alliance with the German princes, he called off the meetings of the theologians. The Lutheran leaders finally questioned the sincerity of the English king and became suspicious of English overtures.

A change had also taken place in the leadership of the Lutheran Church in Germany. Martin Luther died in 1546, and the leadership of that Church had been assumed by Philip Melanchthon. This leader had had some influence on

the English king. The doctrine of Justification taught in the King's Book was based on Melanchthon's interpretation of the doctrine.[60] The German theologian's tendency to compromise and to seek to harmonize conflicting doctrinal views drew him closer to the views of the mediating theologians.[61] The struggle among the followers of Luther in the Adiaphoristic and Majoristic controversies divided the Lutherans and prevented them from making a unified witness to their faith as they had done in earlier years.[62]

English Church leaders soon turned to the mediating theologians for guidance and for inspiration. Martin Bucer and Henry Bullinger were the two leaders who greatly influenced subsequent events. Indirectly, this acceptance of the views of these men helped to prepare the way for John Calvin's voice to be heard in subsequent years.

---

[60]Rupp, op. cit., p. 111.

[61]F. Bente, "Historical Introductions to the Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," Triglot Concordia, pp. 23-28.

[62]Reinhold Seeberg, Textbook of the History of Doctrine, translated by Charles E. Hay (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952), II, 347-90.

CHAPTER III

CALVINISM IN ENGLAND DURING THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI AS SEEN IN THE FORMULARIES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

The concept of royal absolutism in the Church of England came in for a severe test during the short reign of Edward VI, king of England from 28 January 1547 to 6 July 1553. Yet during this six-year reign of the boy-king, revolutionary changes were made in the theology, in the worship, and in the formularies of the Church of England. Some of these changes were Calvinist.

Primarily responsible for the changes were the following: King Edward VI, particularly during the latter years of his reign; Thomas Cranmer; Sir Edward Seymour, the king's uncle, who was made Duke of Somerset and proclaimed "Governor of the person of the King's Majesty and Protector of all his realms,"[1] who served from 13 March 1547 to his arrest 10 October 1549 as the regent of the land; John Dudley, the Viscount Lisle, who was created the Earl of Warwick and later the Duke of Northumberland, who succeeded Seymour as the principal power behind the throne.

The principal religious articles effecting the changes were the bishops' petitions to the new king for a renewal

---

[1]John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials Relating Chiefly to Religion and the Reformation of It, And the Emergencies of the Church of England, Under King Henry VIII. King Edward VI. And Queen Mary I. With Large Appendixes, Containing Original Papers, Records, &c. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), II.i.26. Cited as Ecclesiastical Memorials.

of their episcopal jurisdiction; injunctions by the king and by the bishops to their clergy; the imposition of the official Book of Homilies: Parliament's act Against the Revilers of the Sacrament, The Order of Communion, and a statute providing that bishops were to be appointed by letters patent; the First Prayer Book of 1549; a rite for conferring Holy Orders; a law permitting priests to marry; the Second Prayer Book of 1552; the Forty-Two Articles of 1553; King Edward's Catechism of 1553; and the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum of 1553, a proposed code of canon law.

The religious program was "the production of a small group of passionately earnest clerical intellectuals, . . . divines not always, by any means, in agreement among themselves."[2] The principal figure was Thomas Cranmer. Playing an important part in the Edwardian Reformation were the Protestant bishops, particularly Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London; John Hooper, bishop of Gloucester; Hugh Latimer, bishop of Worcester, and others. The Scotsman, John Knox, and the foreign theologians who were invited to assist Cranmer and who accepted the invitation to go to England also played their part. Of the latter, Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr were especially prominent. Some of these men were mediating theologians; others adopted their views during the era.

A change in the thought and the practice of the Church was guaranteed by Henry VIII's choice of tutors for his son

---

[2]Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), II, 82.

and heir. All three men, Sir John Cheke, Sir Anthony Cooke, and Dr. Richard Cox favored the change. Pollard indicates that Henry VIII tipped the balance in favor of the reformers when he chose the executors of his will.[3]

The Edwardian Reformation passed through two phases. The first may be characterized as Lutheran. The second phase was Calvinist, at least as far as the controverted doctrine of the Lord's Supper was concerned. The question of Church ritual became an important issue of the day. Some favored the retention of ceremonies, except for those manifestly superstitious, while others opposed their use.

The stage had been set by Henry VIII. The ties with Rome had been broken. The primate of the land held to some Lutheran teachings. A number of bishops had been influenced in their religious orientation by their reading of theological treatises published by the continental reformers. The Bible had been made available in the vernacular. Some of the official articles of the preceeding reign had an evangelical ring, even though they were superseded by other articles which nullified their teachings. The king's tutors were Protestants, and his council consisted of some men who saw personal advantages in changing the theology of the Church.

The most evident changes that took place on the religious

---

[3]A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603), Vol. VI The Political History of England, ed. by William Hunt and Reginald Poole (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), p. 3. Hereafter cited as History of England.

scene were in the area of ritual and in the worship services. It was particularly here that the English citizen saw the effect of the changes made in the Church's theology. "'The majority of Englishmen,' it has been said, 'probably had no keen desire for doctrinal change': a real feat of understatement in a specialist historian."[4] The people in at least one instance resented the changes which were made. "The Cornish rebellion seems to have been in the main a reaction against religious innovations.[5]

The first act of the executors of Henry's will was to choose Sir Edward Seymour as Protector. This was done with the connivance of Sir William Paget, the former king's principal secretary who had all of the apparatus of administration under his control. Somerset then proceeded to establish his own council and thereby secured his control of the affairs of state.[6]

Hardly had the former king been buried (16 February 1547) and the young king crowned (20 February 1547) when agitation for religious change broke out. Eight days after Henry's funeral Nicholas Ridley preached at court on Ash Wednesday against Catholic devotion to the saints and against sacramentals. Here and there men began to break religious statuary.

---

[4]Hughes, op. cit., II, 83 quoting Pollard, Cranmer, p. 188.

[5]G. R. Elton, "The Reformation in England," The New Cambridge Modern History (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958), II, 243. Cited as N.C.M.H.

[6]Pollard, History of England, pp. 4-9.

Catholics, like Stephen Gardiner, the bishop of Winchester, protested and demanded that action be taken to prevent such happenings.[7]

Stephen Gardiner's power as the leader of Catholic opposition to the pending changes was shortly thereafter broken. Gardiner protested for the second time when he was forced to surrender his episcopal jurisdiction to the crown and receive it back from the new sovereign as the law demanded.[8] Gardiner felt that the episcopal office had been diminished, and he objected to Paget who had drawn up the new authorization. Gardiner's objections to what was happening finally resulted in his imprisonment. Another Catholic leader, Edmund Bonner, the bishop of London, was likewise imprisoned about the same time. Bonner submitted but Gardiner remained in prison for a year. Catholic power was effectively broken by these events.

Even while Gardiner was protesting against the trend he saw coming, changes in the theology and in the practice of the Church of England were being planned. On 16 May 1547 the jurisdiction of the bishops in their dioceses was suspended. A visitation of all churches was announced. While the visitation was delayed until 1 August, the royal commissioners were supplied with the royal injunction[9] as to ordered changes.

---

[7]Hughes, op. cit., II, 86.

[8]Ibid., 86-87.

[9]Henry Gee and William Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History Compiled from Original Sources (London: Macmillan Co., Ltd., 1896), no. LXXVIII, pp. 412-31. Cited as Documents.

The Injunctions of 31 July 1547 called upon all churchmen to observe the principle of royal supremacy in the Church. They warned against the improper use of and the superstitious use of images and sacramentals. Pilgrimages were banned, as were processions around the church buildings, the use of candles before images, the rosary and all practices "tending to idolatry and superstition." Churchmen were asked to observe "the laudable ceremonies of the Church." Church records were to be carefully kept. Provision for the care of the poor was ordered. Doctrinally, the injunctions stated that all clergymen were to own and study the New Testament both in English and in Latin. A copy of Erasmas' Paraphrases of the Gospels was to be placed in every church. The bishops were ordered to examine the clergy in their dioceses. Most important of all from a doctrinal view, the order required that a sermon be read weekly in the churches from a prescribed Book of Homilies.[10] In ordering this, the Injunctions of Edward went beyond those already imposed in 1536 and 1538 by Henry VIII.

---

[10]Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed by the King's Majesty To Be Declared and Read by All Parsons, Vicars and Curates, Every Sunday in Their Churches Where They Have Cure in Certain Sermons Or Homilies Appointed To Be Read in the Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth; And Reprinted by Authority from King James I. A.D. 1623 to Which Are Added the Constitution and Canons of the Church of England, Set Forth A.D. 1603 with an Appendix Containing the Articles of Religion, Constitution, and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States Of America. Third American, From The Last English Edition. (Philadelphia: Edward Biddle, 1844). The critical apparatus permits the reconstruction of the original homilies issued during 1547. Cited as The Book of Homilies.

The Book of Homilies contained twelve fairly short homilies or sermons. The titles are descriptive of the material they contain. They bore the titles: I. "A Fruitful Exhortation to the Reading of Holy Scripture." II. "Of the Misery of all Mankind." III. "Of the Salvation of all Mankind." IV. "Of Christian Love and Charity." V. "Of Good Works." VI. "Of Christian Love and Charity." VII. "Against Swearing and Perjury." VIII. "Of the Declining from God." IX. "An Exhortation against the Fear of Death." X. "An Exhortation to Obedience." XI. "Against Whoredom and Adultery." XII. "Against Strife and Contention." Five of the homilies were written by Thomas Cranmer, two were penned by Thomas Becon, Cranmer's chaplain, one was written by Edmund Bonner, one by Hugh Latimer, and one was written by John Harpsfield. The authors of two of the homilies are unknown.[11]

The sermon book develops the evangelical doctrine of Justification by grace through faith in Jesus Christ and the doctrine of Sanctification. As such the homilies reintroduced the theology of Article III of the Ten Articles of 1536. An example of this is found in Cranmer's "Homily of Faith" or "A Short Declaration of the True, Lively, and Christian Faith" as it is known by its longer title. There faith is described as:

> . . . a sure trust and confidence in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and a steadfast hope of all good

---

[11]Hughes, op. cit., II, 5. n.4.

> things to be received at God's hand; and that, although we through infirmity, or temptation of our ghostly enemy, do fall from him by sin, yet if we return again unto him by true repentance, that he will forgive and forget our offences for his Son's sake, our Saviour Jesus Christ, and will make us inheritors with him of his everlasting kingdom.12

Cranmer also asserts:

> For the very sure and lively Christian faith is, not only to believe all things of God which are contained in the holy scripture, but also is an earnest trust and confidence in God, . . . that he will be merciful unto us for his only Son's sake.13

Most Protestants, including Calvinists, would subscribe to this definition of faith. The Book of Homilies does not touch on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

Edward's first Parliament was soon involved in the changes being made by the leaders of the Church. It began its sessions on 4 November 1547. At the same time the clergymen met and agreed that communion should henceforth be distributed to the laity in both kinds. Parliament made the Convocation's decision the law of the realm in an "Act Against Revilers, and For Receiving in Both Kinds."[14]

This act called for uniformity in the communion service based on "love rather than for fear." The reason for the statute, the act stated, was the abuse of the Sacrament by "contentious and arrogant men." The act spoke somewhat guardedly about the Sacrament itself and what the communicant actually received. After rehearsing the words of institution it

---

[12]The Book of Homilies, p. 30.

[13]Ibid., p. 31.

[14]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXVII, pp. 322-38.

speaks "Of the which bread whosoever eateth, or of the which cup whosoever drinketh, unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation and judgment to himself, making no difference of the Lord's body." A Lutheran could accept this wording, wishing perhaps that it would have been stated that in, with and under the bread and wine the communicant receives the body and blood of Christ. A Zwinglian or a Calvinist might also accept the wording, providing that he was free to place his own interpretation on the meaning of the words used.

The act sought to prevent all future debate about the Sacrament. It warned that anyone who "by any words of depraving, despising or reviling" debated the Sacrament would be arrested, tried, and if convicted, imprisoned. The act failed in this regard, since the debate on the Sacrament continued to go on.

The act also stated that in accord with Christ's own institution and in accord with the practice of the early Church "the said Sacrament should be ministered to all Christian people under both kinds of bread and wine." Once again, the act spoke guardedly about distributing both the bread and the wine by adding the words "except necessity otherwise require." No further explanation is given as to what is meant by these words. The English Church also refused to speak in favor or against the practice of other communions in other lands. The statute ended with the words "not condemning hereby the usage of any Church out of the king's majesty's dominions."

The act still required that communicants make proper

preparation for the reception of the Sacrament at least one day before the service. A prescribed exhortation was to be read to the communicants the day of the service.

The action of Parliament made a break with the theology of the Roman Catholic Church. While the term "priest" was still retained, the preferred term appears to have been "minister." The term "Mass" was not used. The Sacrament was referred to as "the Sacrament of the altar," or "the communion" or "the supper and table of the Lord." The act is not Calvinistic in its description of the Sacrament. It does not speak of a spiritual eating and drinking, nor does it say that the wicked do not receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament.

Parliament also passed legislation which repealed Henry's treason and heresy laws. Repealed were all the statutes "de haeretico comburendo," the "Act of the Six Articles," "and all and every act or acts of parliament touching doctrine or matters of religion."[15] It was still treason, according to the legislation passed, to attempt to alter the succession to the crown as regulated by statute and by the will of Henry VIII.

Two other church measures were passed by the first Parliament. The one swept away the old laws about episcopal elections and stated that bishops thereafter were to be appointed by letters patent. The other measure was an "Act

---

[15]Pollard, op. cit., p. 16.

Dissolving the Chantries."[16] With the setting aside of the Six Articles Act, masses for the dead were no longer justified and the monasteries where some of the masses were said had been closed. The funds belonging to the religious foundations were ordered to be given to the crown upon the recommendation of the king's commissioners.

On 8 March 1548 another important step was ordered in the process of reforming the Church of England. On that day the Order of Communion[17] in English was published and directed for use. With certain modifications, this rite was later incorporated into the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The Order of Communion has a Lutheran ring to it, and the doctrine of the Real Presence underlies the prescribed form. Calvinist objections to the wording and subsequent changes which were made in the Second Prayer Book would indicate that they considered the Order of Communion capable of a Lutheran interpretation.

In the prescribed order the minister was called upon to read an Exhortation at least one day before the communion service. These words were used in this Exhortation:

> . . . wherefore our duty is, to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to be given to almighty God for his infinite mercy and benefits, given and bestowed upon us, his unworthy servants, for whom he hath not only

---

[16]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXVIII, pp. 328-57.

[17]"Order of Communion," in The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552 with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI, ed. for the Parker Society by Joseph Ketley (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844), pp. 3-8. Cited as The Two Liturgies.

> given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and mystery to give us his said body and blood spiritually: to feed and drink upon.

In the Exhortation prescribed to be read on the day of the communion the minister spoke these words:

> . . . For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart, and lively faith we receive this holy Sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; . . .) so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily, for then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour, we eat and drink our own damnation.

Before the words of consecration the rubric prescribed a prayer with these words: ". . . grant us, . . . so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood in these holy mysteries." The words of distribution were: "The body (blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given (shed) for thee keep thy soul unto everlasting life." These were some of the words that Calvinists objected to and wanted changed in a revision of the Prayer Book.

The rubric directing the assistant that he "may follow with the chalice as the priest ministereth the bread, so shall he minister the wine," by emphasizing the terms "bread" and "wine" prevent any possibility of a Roman Catholic concept of transubstantiation from being read into the Order of Communion.

While Cranmer was effecting these changes in the Church of England's ritual, he also saw fit to authorize a catechism for use.[18] This catechism had been translated into English

---

[18]"Catechismus That Is To Say, A Short Instruction Into Christian Religion For The Singular Commodity And Profit Of Children And Young People" in the Fathers of the English Church (London: John Harchard, 1809), III, 113-325.

from a German Lutheran Catechism of Nuremberg.[19] It is not illogical to presume that Cranmer, at this time at least, accepted the Lutheran view of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper. The words of the catechism, which came to be known as Cranmer's Catechism, clearly taught the Lutheran view, since it reads:

> Christ said of the bread, "This is my body"; and of the cup he saith, "This is my blood." Wherefore we ought to believe that in the sacrament we receive the body and blood of Christ. For God is almighty (as ye heard in the Creed), he is able therefore to do all things what he will.[20]

Cranmer's views on the doctrine of the Real Presence and the teaching he advocated in 1548 when he authorized this Catechism soon changed. With this change was brought about the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the established Church, at least as far as this specific doctrine is concerned.

Important in the change of interpretation were several factors. One was the assistance Cranmer sought from continental theologians. Cranmer wanted some of those men to come to England to help in formulating a theological basis for the changes he advocated. In that vein he wrote to John à Lasco in a letter dated 4 July 1548:

> We are desirous of setting forth in our churches the true doctrine of God. . . . For the purpose of carrying this important design into execution we have thought it necessary to have the assistance of learned men, who, having compared their opinions together with us, may do away with all doctrinal controversies, and build up an entire

---

[19]Carl S. Meyer, "Cranmer's Legacy," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVII (April 1956), 252-53.

[20]"Catechismus," Fathers of the English Church, III, 318.

> system of true doctrine. We have therefore invited both yourself and some other learned men.[21]

The "learned men" Cranmer invited to England included John Calvin, Philip Melanchthon, Peter Martyr, Henry Bullinger, Martin Bucer, John à Lasco among others. He expressed the invitation to Martin Bucer in the same vein that he invited the others. Cranmer wrote, "Come over therefore to us, and become a labourer with us in the harvest of the Lord."[22]

Cranmer felt an immediate urgency about a conclave of Protestant theologians when he read the Decrees that were starting to come from the Roman Catholic Council meeting in Trent. He repeated his invitation to the Protestant leaders to meet, to resolve their differences particularly on the disputed Sacrament of the Altar, and to present a united front to a common opponent. Cranmer expressed this concern in a letter to Henry Bullinger dated 20 March 1552 in which he wrote:

> I consider it better, foreasmuch as our adversaries who are now holding their councils in Trent . . . to recommend his majesty to grant assistance, that in England, or elsewhere, there might be convoked a synod of the most learned and excellent persons, in which provision might be made for the purity of ecclesiastical doctrine, and especially for an agreement upon the sacramentarian controversy.[23]

The conclave of theologians never materialized.

---

[21] Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation Written During the Reign of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich, ed. for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1846), I, 17-18, ep. IX. Hereafter cited as O.L.

[22] Ibid., 2 October 1548, I, 19-20, ep. XI.

[23] Ibid., I, 22-24, ep. XIII.

The assistance, however, that Cranmer sought from some of the continental divines did materialize. Foreign theologians who emigrated to England during the Edwardian era included: Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli, who were given important university posts at Cambridge and Oxford respectively; John à Lasco, Martin Micronius, Bernadine Ochino, and Valerand Poullain; also others. Bucer, Martyr and à Lasco were particularly active in the changes effected. Most of the foreign theologians who entered England held to a mediating view on the Lord's Supper.[24]

While some of the continental divines declined the invitation to go to England and there give their personal assistance, they did make their influence felt through the frequent correspondence they had with the English divines. Henry Bullinger, particularly, frequently corresponded with some of the English leaders. The letters that have been preserved also give an insight into the problems and the progress of the Edwardian Reformation.

Another factor which played a part, though a minor one, was the emigration of several thousand religious exiles forced from their homeland by the Interim of 1548. Some of these people emigrated to England. Nearly five thousand of them settled in the London area alone. They made up nearly ten per cent of the population of the city. These exiles were

---

[24]Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "Anglo-Lutheran Relations during the First Two Years of the Reign of Edward VI," Concordia Theological Monthly, VI (September 1935), 671-72.

permitted to have their own churches with their own forms of worship and their own pastors. One of these pastors was Valerand Poullain. Poullain had succeeded John Calvin as the pastor of a church in Strassburg when Calvin was invited to return again to Geneva. The citizens of London could not help but be influenced by this large number of Calvinist religious exiles.[25]

Near the middle of the Edwardian reign, some of the Church leaders became worried. Rebellion had flared up in parts of the country; demands were heard that further changes in religion be stopped and that the country return to the religious conditions which existed towards the end of the reign of Henry.[26] The unsettled conditions and other factors ultimately resulted in the imprisonment of the Protector. Since Somerset had gone along with the reformers, some of them became uneasy. One of them, John Hooper, expressed this concern in a letter written to Henry Bullinger dated 7 November 1549. Hooper told the Zurich divine: "The face of things is now changed. . . . My patron [Somerset] . . . is now imprisoned with many others in the Tower of London."[27]

The Protestant leaders had little to fear, however.

---

[25]Frederick Norwood, The Reformation Refugees As an Economic Force (Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1942), pp. 8-10.

[26]Jasper Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 330.

[27]O.L., I, 69-71, ep. XXXV.

Seymour's successor, the Duke of Northumberland, proved himself in favor of the changes the reformers had made and were making. While Northumberland had his troubles, he consolidated his position and weathered the storms of office.[28] During his tenure in power, the Catholic bishops were deprived of their offices. Bishop Stephen Gardiner of Winchester, Bishop George Day of Chichester, Bishop George Heath of Rochester, and Bishop Edmund Bonner of London were all removed from their episcopal sees. Stephen Gardiner was deprived on 14 February for having opposed the changes which had been ordered. Day was deprived in September 1551 for having refused to tear down the altars in his diocese. Heath was removed for opposing the new Order of Communion about the same time, as was the imprisoned Bishop Bonner. Their sees, together with one vacated by the death of Bishop Wakeman, were filled by John Hooper, John Ponet or Poynet, Nicholas Ridley, and John Scory.[29]

The elevation of some of these men to positions of power and influence in the Church of England helped to turn the tide in favor of Calvinism. From their treatises and from their correspondence it is possible to study their views on the controverted topics of the day. The chief theological problem was still the Lord's Supper. A theologian's position on this Sacrament depended upon his Christology. Luther's doctrine of the communicatio idiomaticum led him to teach the ubiquity

---

[28]Pollard, op. cit., pp. 41-46.

[29]Hughes, op. cit., II, 113-21.

of Christ. Luther, and the Formula of Concord later, taught that the whole Christ was truly and substantially present in the reception of the Sacrament and was received in, cum, et sub the bread and wine. Luther concluded that the unworthy communicant also receives the body and blood of Christ. Reformed theologians differed as to the mode of Christ's presence in the Sacrament. They appear unanimous, however, in denying that the unworthy communicant receives the body and blood of Christ. They tended to agree that the natural body of Christ was in heaven and there it would remain until Christ came at the end of time. They taught that the worthy communicant received the body and blood of Christ not by the mouth, but "only spiritually, in the exercise of faith."[30] This was the view held by Bullinger and agreed to by Calvin in the Consensus Tigurinus.[31]

John Hooper indicated his acceptance of the Reformed view of the Sacrament long before he was made a bishop of the Anglican Church. In a letter dated 27 January, probably in 1546, Hooper expressed his anti-Lutheran views on the Sacrament. Speaking of the Count of the Palatine, Hooper wrote to Bullinger:

> . . . but as far as relates to the eucharist, he [the count] has descended, as the proverb has it, from the horse to the ass; for he has fallen from popery into the doctrine of Luther, who is in that particular more

---

[30]Archibald A. Hodge, Outline of Theology (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1868), p. 509.

[31]Edward A. Litton, Introduction to Dogmatic Theology. New rev. ed. by Philip E. Hughes (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1960), pp. 492-535.

erroneous than all the papists.[32]

During Henry VIII's reign Hooper had been a religious exile, so strong were his convictions against the Catholic doctrine of the Mass. He had spent six years with Bullinger during which time he had imbibed "the purest milk of Zwinglianism."[33]

In 1548 Hooper also refused to accept the mediating view espoused by Martin Bucer. In a letter to Bucer dated 19 January 1548 Hooper wrote:

> You write. . . . that you cannot believe the sacraments to be bare signs. Far be such a belief from the most unlearned Christian! The holy supper is not a bare sign, neither in it is the true and natural body of Christ corporally exhibited to me in any supernatural or heavenly manner: nevertheless, I . . . venerate and reverence the institution of Christ.[34]

Later Hooper appears to have come around to a Bucerian or Calvinist view of the Sacrament. In the sixty-fifth article of A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith written in 1550, he confessed:

> . . . and therefore I do not believe that the body of Christ can be contained, hid, or inclosed in the bread, under the bread, or with the bread; neither the blood in the wine, under the wine, or with the wine. But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven on the right hand of the Father . . . and that always and as often as we use this bread and wine according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive his body and blood.[35]

---

[32] O.L., I, 33-38, ep. XXI.

[33] Pollard, op. cit., p. 51.

[34] O.L., I, 47-8, ep. XXV.

[35] Later Writings of Bishop Hooper Together with His Letters and Other Pieces, ed. for the Parker Society by Charles Nevinson (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1852), p. 49. Hereafter cited as Later Writings.

This same view was expressed in item Ten of the Visitation Book, which Hooper, then a bishop, wrote for the examiners of his diocese. Hooper wrote the treatise for the visitation of 1551 and 1552. In it he said:

> Item, that in the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, or any manner of corporal or local presence of Christ, in, under, or with the bread and wine, but spiritually by faith.[36]

Consistent in his beliefs, Hooper denied the ubiquity of Christ, as a sermon he delivered before Edward VI reveals.[37]

This was the view to which the other English divines were to come. The change in their concept of the Lord's Supper can be noted during a period of several months in late 1548. Bartholemew Traheron's correspondence with Henry Bullinger helps to pin-point the time. In a letter dated 1 August 1548 Traheron wrote to the Zurich theologian concerning Hugh Latimer: "As to Latimer, though he does not clearly understand the true doctrine of the eucharist, . . . there is good hope that he will some time or other come over to our side altogether."[38] Less than two months later the same correspondent wrote on 28 September: ". . . you must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the eucharist." Traheron then immediately adds: "together with the archbishop

---

[36]"Copy of Bishop Hooper's Visitation Book," Later Writings, p. 122.

[37]"Fifth Sermon Upon Jonas," Early Writings of John Hooper, D. D. Lord Bishop of Gloucester And Worcester, Martyr 1555. Ed. for the Parker Society by Samuel Carr (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1843), pp. 514, 515.

[38]O.L., I, 320, ep. CL.

of Canterbury and the other bishops, who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans."[39]

Traheron is correct in stating that Latimer had changed his views on the Lord's Supper. Latimer's sermon on 18 January 1548[40] indicates that at that time he held to the doctrine of the Real Presence. No sermon is extant from Latimer during September 1548, but in a sermon he delivered in 1552 he denied the doctrine of the Real Presence.[41] It was this latter view to which Latimer subscribed during the examinations preceding his martyrdom in 1555. Latimer denied at that time that he had ever been a Lutheran in his views on the Sacrament of the Altar. He said then that he "never could perceive how Luther could defend his opinion without transubstantiation."[42] Latimer's sermons seem to indicate, however, that he did change his mind. Perhaps Traheron is correct as to the time he did so, although no proof is available from Latimer's writings.

A similar change also took place in Nicholas Ridley.

---

[39] Ibid., I, 322, ep. CLI.

[40] "A Sermon Of The Reverend Father Master Hugh Latimer, Preached In The Shrouds At Paul's Church In London, 18 January 1548," Sermons by Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, ed. for the Parker Society by George Corrie (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844), pp. 59-78.

[41] "Sermon On The Parable Of The Marriage Feast," Fathers of the English Church, III, 627ff.

[42] "Disputation At Oxford Between Latimer And Smith," Sermons And Remains of Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, ed. for the Parker Society by George Corrie (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1845), p. 265.

That divine is quoted as having attributed his change to his reading of Ratramnus' treatise and to a conference he had had with Thomas Cranmer and Peter Martyr.[43] Ridley's writings and sermons of 1548 are not available. The view he held in 1555 has been preserved. In a treatise Ridley wrote at that time in prison he denied the doctrine of the Real Presence.[44] Traheron includes Ridley with those bishops who had changed their position and had gone over to a Calvinist interpretation of the Lord's Supper. John Hooper does include Ridley's name with those who held to that view in 1549. In a letter written by Hooper to Bullinger dated 27 December 1549 he wrote:

> There are here six or seven bishops (Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, Ferrar, Holbeach, Barlow) who comprehend the doctrine of Christ as far as relates to the Lord's Supper, with as much clearness and piety as one could desire.[45]

Hooper was qualified to determine the views these men held.

As had been the case with Ridley and Latimer, so it was with the other Protestant bishops of the Church of England. On 3 December 1548 Traheron wrote to Bullinger: "I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and only supporters, have altogether come over to our side."[46] A year later on 5 February 1550

---

[43]"A Biographical Notice Of Nicholas Ridley, D.D.," The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D. Sometime Bishop of London, Martyr 1555, ed. for the Parker Society by Henry Christmas (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1843), p. ix.

[44]"A Treatise Against the Error of Transubstantiation," ibid., p. 13.

[45]O.L., I, 72, ep. XXXVI.

[46]Ibid., I, 323, ep. CLII.

John Hooper wrote the same correspondent:

> The bishops of Canterbury, Rochester, Ely, St. David's, Lincoln and Bath, are all favorable to the cause of God; and, as far as I know, entertain right opinions in the matter of the eucharist . . . the true one, and that . . . which you maintain in Switzerland.[47]

This was the view to which also Thomas Cranmer had come. Whereas it is reasonable to hold that Cranmer held to the doctrine of the Real Presence in the early and middle months of 1548, a change in his views on the Sacrament is indicated towards the end of that year. The change may have begun as early as 28 September as Traheron's letter to Bullinger indicated. On 3 December 1548 Traheron wrote to Bullinger about the circumstances under which the change was observable. He wrote:

> On the 14th of December . . . a disputation was held at London concerning the Eucharist, in the presence of almost all the nobility of England. . . . The archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly and learnedly maintained your opinion on the subject. . . . The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us. I perceive that it is over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal and almost only supporters, have altogether come over to our side.[48]

The change of view of Thomas Cranmer was important. As the leading churchman and the man responsible for writing most of the formularies of the day, it is reasonable to expect that his views would be expressed and found in the official forms after 1548.

The first of these formularies was the Prayer Book,

---

[47] Ibid., I, 74, ep XXXVII.

[48] Ibid., I, 323, ep. CLII.

titled in The First Edwardian Act of Uniformity, A.D. 1549: The Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the use of the Church of England.[49] The Prayer Book replaced the books of the Breviary, Missal, Pontifical and others, and brought all of the forms into one volume. The completed book was authorized after much discussion and debate on 21 January 1549. Ten of the bishops favored the bill authorizing the Prayer Book, eight were opposed to its passage. Voting for the bill were Cranmer, Holgate, Goodrich, Sampson, Salcot, Barlow, Holbeach, Chamber, Bush and Nicholas Ridley. These ten men thereby threw their weight behind the effort to change the formularies of the Church of England.[50]

The wording used in the Communion Service of the Prayer Book is important for an insight into the theology of the day. The Communion Prayer reads:

> Hear us (O Merciful) Father we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ.

The prayer for the communicants before receiving the Sacrament has the wording: ". . . that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son, Jesus Christ." In the words prescribed for the pastor in distributing the elements, the

---

[49]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXIX, p. 359.

[50]Hughes, op. cit., II, 106, n. 2.

minister in giving the bread said: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." In the distribution of the wine the pastor said: "The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."[51] The wording used would indicate that a Lutheran interpretation would normally be placed on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

The Order of the Communion, as well as other parts of the Prayer Book, had been largely the work of Cranmer aided by a committee. They used much of the existing liturgies of the Church, together with forms which were developed during the era.[52] The wording itself, as used, is not conclusive to prove or to disprove the contention that there is nothing Calvinist in the theology of the communion service. Martin Bucer, a mediating theologian, said that he could generally subscribe to the new form and the wording used.[53]

Some of the reformers objected to the new formulary. They were asked to submit their criticism of the Prayer Book. Among those asked to comment was Martin Bucer. Bucer offered his suggestions in his Censura Martini Bucer super libro

---

[51]"The Order of the Communion," The Two Liturgies, pp. 89-92.

[52]Carl S. Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559 (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), pp. 60, 61.

[53]Constantin Hopf, Martin Bucer and the English Reformation (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), p. 59.

sacrorum, seu ordinationis Ecclesiae atque ministerii ecclesiastici in regno Angliae.[54] Bucer suggested that the ceremonies and rituals should be changed. His main objections were to the communion service. Bucer wrote that no special importance should be placed on the day the service was to be held. He objected to the vestment rubric, to private communion, to the preparation before the service so that only the exact amount of bread and wine was provided, to the prescribed crossing and kneeling, and he objected particularly to the consecration prayer. He disliked the phrasing "that they may be unto us the body and blood" and proposed that the words be changed to read "with true faith, we might receive the Body and Blood of Christ in these holy mysteries, as heavenly food." Bucer wanted the retention of the wording of the Humble Access "so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ."[55]

Some of the reformers were vehement in their objections to the Prayer Book; particularly Hooper was incensed. He wrote to Henry Bullinger 27 March 1550, indicating his reaction to the book:

> I can scarcely express to you . . . under what difficulties we are labouring and struggling that the idol of the mass may be thrown out. It is no small hinderance to our exertions, that the form which our senate or parliament . . . has prescribed for the whole realm, is so very defective and of doubtful construction, and in some respects manifestly impious. . . . I am so much offended with the book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate

---

[54]Statements from Bucer's Censura and the action taken are given in ibid., pp. 74-81.

[55]Ibid.

with the church in the administration of the supper.[56]

The Prayer Book was too conservative to suit some of the theologians. "They said that the First Prayer Book was too Lutheran."[57] A commission was appointed to revise it, and in 1552 a Second Prayer Book was authorized for use 1 November of that year. Parliament set forth the reason in the enabling statute:

> Where there has been a very godly order set forth by the authority of Parliament . . . agreeable to the word of God and the primitive Church . . . because there has arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the church, . . . divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the administration of the same, rather by curiosity of the minister, and mistakers, than of any worthy cause.[58]

Voting for the Uniformity Bill were Cranmer, Holgate, Barlow, Bush, Ridley, Bird, Ferrar, Hooper, Ponet and Coverdale. Only two bishops opposed its passage.[59] Apparently even the most vocal objectors to the First Prayer Book were satisfied with the changes made.

Some of the suggested changes were accepted, while others were not. In the Order of the Communion the words of the distribution were changed to read:

> Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.
>
> Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

---

[56] O.L., I, 79, ep. XXXVIII.

[57] Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559, p. 61.

[58] Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXXI, pp. 370, 371.

[59] Hughes, op. cit., II, 123, n. 1.

The prescribed prayer for the communicants read:

> . . . and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.[60]

The rubric still prescribed that the communicant kneel to receive the elements. Some of the reformers objected to this, particularly John Knox.[61] The pages of the Prayer Book had already been run off the presses. To satisfy Knox a rubric explaining the purpose of kneeling was appended to the Prayer Book. This is the so-called Black Rubric.[62]

At the same time that the First Prayer Book had been authorized, a rite for Conferring Holy Orders had also been authorized.[63] Once again it was Hooper who objected. Hooper was severely critical of the oath "swearing by God, the saints, and the holy gospels." He objected to this oath in the presence of the King and others. In a letter he wrote to Bullinger dated 27 March 1550 Hooper described his action, saying:

> A book has been lately published here by the bishops touching the ordination and consecration of the bishops and ministers of the church. I have sent it . . . that you may know their fraud and artifices, by which they promote the kingdom of anti-christ, especially in the form of the oath against which form I brought forth

---

[60]"Order of the Communion," The Two Liturgies, pp. 76-106.

[61]Geddes MacGregor, The Thundering Scot: A Portrait of John Knox (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957), p. 60.

[62]"The Black Rubric," The Two Liturgies, p. 283.

[63]"Book of Consecration of Archbishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons," The Two Liturgies, pp. 159-86.

> many objections in my public lecture before the king and the nobility of the realm: on which account I have incurred no small hostility. . . . The archbishop spoke against me with great severity on account of my having censured the form of the oath.[64]

The young king Edward VI was so moved by Hooper's objections to the wording of the oath that he personally struck it from the formulary.

Another important act passed by Convocation and enacted into law by Parliament in 1549 was a bill entitled: Marriage of Priests Legalized.[65] This was one of the steps advocated by all of the reformers of all persuasions.

Before time ran out on the Edwardian era several other formularies were authorized by the king. One consisted of a number of articles agreed upon by the clergy to give a theological basis to the changes which had been made in the Church. The proper title of the formulary is: Articles Agreed Upon In The Convocation And Published By The King's Majesty.[66] These articles later formed one of the bases for the Thirty-Nine Articles adopted by Parliament in 1571 during the reign of Elizabeth I. A study of the articles shows their dependence in part on Lutheran Confessions.[67] The Forty-Two Articles, as they are better known, were approved by the synod of London in 1552. However, they were not published until 20 May 1553.[68]

---

[64] O.L., pp. 78-85, ep. XXXVIII.

[65] Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXX, pp. 366-68.

[66] The Two Liturgies, pp. 526-37.

[67] Meyer, "Cranmer's Legacy," XXVII, 236-68.

[68] Joseph Ketley, "Preface," The Two Liturgies, p. x.

The first paragraph of the article dealing with the Lord's Supper reads:

> The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a communion of the body of Christ, likewise the Cup of blessing is a communion of the blood of Christ.[69]

The wording Cranmer chose when he wrote "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same" introduced an idea not found in the earlier formularies of the Church of England. The concept is not found in the Augsburg Confession or the Lutheran Confessions, which were used in part as a basis for the Forty-Two Articles. The words used imply that only the worthy communicant receives the body of Christ. Nothing is said about the unworthy guest, but it is implied that such a communicant does not receive the body and blood of Christ. As such the paragraph appears to deny the doctrine of the Real Presence, a teaching earlier formularies maintained.

The second paragraph also reveals a divergence from the earlier accepted doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ. That doctrine underlay earlier concepts of the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. A theologian's Christology forced him to accept or to reject the teaching that Christ was really present in the reception of the Sacrament. The framers of this paragraph clearly deny the communication of attributes in the Person of Christ. The paragraph reads:

---

[69] The Two Liturgies, p. 534.

> Transubstantiation, or the change of substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood, cannot be proved by holy writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. Foreasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the selfsame man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place, therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world; a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[70]

While this paragraph was primarily directed against the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, it indirectly also attacked the Lutheran teaching of the Real Presence.

The third paragraph of this article on the Lord's Supper consisted of one sentence. The thought expressed was shared in common by both Lutheran and Reformed theologians. The paragraph was directed against the Roman Catholic practice and reads: "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped."[71]

The teaching of the entire article was that which was held by the mediating theologians, including John Calvin. As early as 1537 Martin Bucer had drawn up a Confession of Faith concerning the Eucharist,[72] in which Bucer indicated the acceptance by Reformed theologians of the views held by

---

[70] Ibid.

[71] Ibid.

[72] "Confession of Faith concerning the Eucharist," Calvin: Theological Treatises, ed. by J. K. S. Reid, in The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), XXII, 168, 169.

John Calvin. Bucer's Confession indicated that the Wittenberg Concord subscribed to by the Strassburg and the Wittenberg divines in 1536 had failed to resolve the differences separating the Lutherans and the Reformed theologians. Bucer wrote:

> This statement of our dear brothers and colleagues, G. Farel, John Calvin and R. Viret, we embrace as right doctrine, believing Christ our Lord in no sense to be diffused locally or ubiquitously in the Holy Supper, but that he has a true and finite body and remains in heavenly glory. Yet none the less, through his word and symbols, he is present in the Supper: He presents himself to us as we are by faith exalted to heaven with him, so that the bread we break and the cup through which we show Christ forth may be for us really the communion of his body and blood.[73]

This was the teaching Calvin advocated in his Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord and only Saviour Jesus Christ[74] published in 1541. This in turn was the doctrine put forth as the standard of faith in the Forty-Two Articles.

The same year that the Forty-Two Articles was accepted, Convocation and the king authorized the publication of a Catechism. The short book was intended for the teaching of the impressionable young and affords an insight into the accepted teaching of the day. The Catechism was written by Bishop Ponet.[75] Officially the work is entitled: A Short Catechism; Or Plain Instruction, Containing the Sum of Christian Learning Set Forth by the King's Authority, For All Schoolmasters to Teach.[76] The Catechism is in the form

---

[73] Ibid.

[74] "Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord and only Saviour Jesus Christ," ibid., XXII, 142-66.

[75] Joseph Ketley, "Preface," The Two Liturgies, p. xii.

[76] Ibid., pp. 489-526.

of a dialogue between a Master and a Scholar. Concerning the presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper the Master asks the question: "What declareth and betokeneth the supper to us, which we soberly use in the remembrance of the Lord? The scholar answers:

> The Supper . . . is a certain thankful remembrance of the death of Christ: forasmuch the bread representeth his body betrayed to be crucified for us; the wine standeth in stead and place of his blood plenteously shed for us. And even as by bread and wine our natural bodies are sustained and nourished: so by the body, that is the flesh and blood of Christ, the soul is fed through faith, and quickened to the heavenly and godly life.[77]

The answer given here is different from the teaching of the Real Presence in Cranmer's Catechism of 1548. The answer given is a guarded one. From the phrasing used it is difficult to determine what is exactly meant. It does avoid Lutheran terminology.

The person responsible for the introduction of these formularies was Thomas Cranmer. While not the sole author of some of the formularies or even the author of a formulary such as the Catechism, he likely gave his consent to their publication. Cranmer's position, it has been noted, changed toward the end of 1548. When in 1550 Cranmer stated his position on the Lord's Supper,[78] he underlined his answer in reply to the

---

[77]Ibid., p. 517.

[78]"Defence of the True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament," Fathers of the English Church, III, 328ff.

criticism of Stephen Gardiner.[79] Gardiner had sought to prove that Cranmer had changed his mind on the doctrine of the Real Presence. Cranmer replied that he had been misunderstood. He wrote:

> And in a Catechism by me translated and set forth, I used like manner of speech, saying with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ; which my saying divers ignorant persons . . . did carp and reprehend, for lack of good understanding.

Cranmer then proceeded to state his views on the Sacrament writing:

> For this speech . . . be not understood of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ (which in very flesh we neither feel nor see), but that which we do to the flesh and blood, because they be the very signs, figures and tokens, instituted by Christ, to represent unto us his very flesh and blood.[80]

Cranmer's view as here presented is not that of the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence. He here speaks in a manner similar to that of Martin Bucer, one of the heralds of John Calvin. Dugmore calls Cranmer's view a "non-papist Catholic doctrine of the real presence."[81] Cranmer's coverage of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is extensive. The length of his exposition was due, not to his attempt to try to explain the exact involvement of the body and blood of Christ in the

---

[79]"An Answer Unto A Crafty And Sophistical Cavillation By Stephen Gardiner," Writings And Disputations of Thomas Cranmer Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, ed. for the Parker Society by John Cox (Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844), pp. 9ff.

[80]Ibid., p. 226.

[81]C. W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformation (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958), p. 200.

Sacrament, but in order to stress the benefits the true believer receives from the Sacrament. Cranmer did deny that the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar.[82]

The last formulary of the Edwardian period was Cranmer's proposed code of canon law, the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.[83] A commission of thirty-two persons had been appointed on 6 October 1551 to draw up the revised code. The new law was needed since the abrogation of papal supremacy left much of the previous code unworkable. The rough draft of the code was made by a committee of eight members including the archbishop, Bishop Goodrich of Ely, and Peter Martyr.

The proposed code is primarily one of historical interest since Parliament did not act on the measure. The code does underscore the basic thrust of the Edwardian Reformation. The concepts taught in the official formularies were restated and opposing views were declared heretical. One half of the code was devoted to the organization of the church courts. The Duke of Northumberland was not interested in such a measure and told Cranmer to "stick to his clerical functions."[84] This code of canon law was later espoused by zealous reformers

---

[82]"Disputation At Oxford," Writings And Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, p. 426.

[83]REFORMATIO LEGUM ECCLESIASTICARUM, EX AUTHORITATE PRIMUM Regis Henrici 8. inchoata: Deinde per Regem EDOUARDUM provecta, adauctaque in hunc modum, atq; nunc ad pleniorem ipsarum reformationem in lucem edita (Londini: Typis T. H. & R. H. impensis Laurentii Sadler, 1640).

[84]Pollard, op. cit., p. 77.

during the reign of Elizabeth I. At that time, too, it was rejected.

The changes in the formularies of the Church of England came abruptly to an end with the death of Edward VI on 6 July 1553. The end of the era was not a peaceful one for the Protestant reformers. Toward the end there was a growing distrust between Northumberland and "his best supporters, the zealous Protestants."[85]

The Edwardian era did make the country Protestant as far as legislation and formularies could make her so. Calvinism had been introduced into the theology and the worship life of the land. Parliament had become involved in the direction of the Church. This lay involvement was to have an effect during the Elizabethan era.

---

[85] Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

THE OPPOSITION TO CALVINISM IN THE MARIAN REACTION AND COUNTER-RESISTANCE TO THE REACTION

The English Counter-Reformation began officially in October 1555 when Mary's first Parliament repealed Edwardian religious legislation.[1] The anti-Protestant era ended officially in January 1559 when her successor's first Parliament repealed Marian religious statutes.[2] Unofficially, the period spanned the reign of Mary from 19 July 1553 when she was proclaimed queen to her death on 17 November 1558.

The era began on a note of moderation when Mary proclaimed a policy of religious toleration on 18 August 1553.[3] The government's arrest of prominent Protestant leaders at the same time indicated that moderation depended upon religious conformity. Moderation gave way to suppression when some Protestants, particularly Calvinists, refused to conform; and when Protestantism was identified with treason. Conviction of treason and heresy resulted in a trial by fire for some English divines.[4]

---

[1]Henry Gee and William Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History Compiled from Original Sources (London: Macmillan And Co., Ltd., 1896), no. LXXIII, pp. 377-80. Hereafter cited as Documents.

[2]Ibid., no. LXXIX, pp. 442-58.

[3]Ibid., no. LXXII, pp. 373-76.

[4]Jasper Ridley, Thomas Cranmer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 350.

The Counter-Reformation attempted to wipe out all resistance to the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic Church in England. It did not succeed. While it temporarily halted the Reformation officially, it paved the way for a more widespread acceptance of Protestantism in subsequent eras. The Marian era made Roman Catholicism distasteful to most nationalistically minded Englishmen, and it made Protestantism, particularly Calvinism, to a great extent synonymous with patriotism.

The Counter-Reformation and its effects are significant in a study of the furtherance of Calvinism in England. During the era many English citizens were inspired by the heroism of the Marian martyrs. During the period a number of influential Englishmen became religious exiles and found a haven in continental centers where Calvin's influence was dominant. These men became more imbued with the spirit of Calvin while there, studied Calvin's theology first-hand in some instances, shared their enthusiasm with their counter-parts in their homeland, and grew in their determination to advance Calvinism in England when they would be permitted to return to their homes.[5]

Englishmen varied in their reaction to the return of the English Church to Roman Catholicism. Most Englishmen easily and readily returned to the faith to which they had subscribed in earlier eras. Protestantism for these people had never gone more than skin deep. When the crown reinstated Roman Catholicism and repealed Edwardian religious statutes, these once

---

[5]J. E. Neale, Queen Elizabeth (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1934), p. 29.

nominal Protestants became nominal Roman Catholics. Other Englishmen kept their real religious convictions fairly well hidden and waited out the era. Some went into seclusion, some joined secret Protestant congregations, and in general escaped official notice. Other Englishmen were vociferous in their resistance to the introduction of Roman Catholicism. Some were martyred for their faith, some committed acts of high treason, some fled to foreign lands from which places they could speak and write against the government's actions, while others remained at home where they defied the government and circulated anti-Catholic literature. Some, who were members of the House of Commons, fought to prevent the passage of government sponsored religious legislation.

Twenty years of Reformation had failed to produce a deep commitment to the Protestant cause by most Englishmen. Mary began her reign with the support of the majority of her subjects. Spiritually, the people were indifferent and were willing to follow the example of their ruler. A member of the Venetian embassy at the time, while overstating the situation, is quoted as saying that Englishmen were ready "in outward show to follow their Prince's example and order, even were he a Mohammedan or Jew."[6]

Even those high in the councils of the land during the Edwardian era made their peace with Mary and became nominal Roman Catholics. Perhaps typical of this group was

---

[6]Ibid.

William Cecil, a member of the Privy Council. Cecil's first impulse was to flee, but when he found that the majority of the Council had determined to make its peace with Mary, Cecil was ready to do the same.[7] "Cecil's first devotion was the welfare of England. Even his zeal for his faith was subservient to that."[8] Of like opinion were most of the members of the House of Lords. Once cleared of its Protestant bishops, the House of Lords passed government-sponsored legislation with little hesitancy.[9]

Some Protestants were deprived of their offices, but they waited out the era in relative safety. Matthew Parker was a typical representative of this group. When Mary became queen, Parker was deprived of his office as Dean of Lincoln together with the other offices he held at the time. However, when he looked back later to his days during Mary's reign, he did so almost with nostalgia. He wrote of his feelings at that time:

> After this I lived as a private individual, as happy before God in my conscience, and so far from being ashamed or dejected, that the delightful literary leisure to which the good providence of God recalled me yielded me much greater pleasure and more solid enjoyments, than the former busy and dangerous kind of life ever afforded.[10]

---

[7]Martin Hume, The Great Lord Burghley (New York: McClure, Phillips, and Co., 1906), p. 71.

[8]Conyers Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955), p. 101.

[9]Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (London: Carter, Hollis, 1953), II, 201.

[10]Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D. Archbishop of Canterbury Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, From A.D. 1535, to His Death, A.D. 1575, ed. for the Parker Society by John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1853), p. viii.

Matthew Parker and others of like temperament felt no need to flee England. These men were generally undisturbed during the era. Most of them neither made propaganda for their faith, nor did they violently attack the established Church.

There were other Englishmen, however, who were determined to oppose the Counter-Reformation. These men not only refused to abandon Protestantism, they also continued to make their protests heard. Some were members of the House of Commons. Some circulated and directed the publication of banned Protestant treatises and tracts. Some died for their faith rather than recant. Members of this group were the despair of Mary's government. They kept the people agitated to resist the orders of the government in religious matters. Some of these vocal Protestants were Calvinists.

Some of the resistance to Mary and her government stemmed from personal and patriotic reasons, even though the leaders of the resistance sought to achieve their end under the guise of religion. Northumberland's plot, for example, to keep Mary from succeeding to the throne was defended on the grounds of trying to guarantee Protestant accession to the throne. In reality, Northumberland sought only to perpetuate his own power.[11] Another act of high treason occurred in January 1554 when Sir Arthur Wyatt led a rebellion against Mary. Wyatt and the rebels claimed they wanted to prevent the queen from marrying Philip, the Prince of Spain. Actually, the rebels

---

[11]Ridley, op. cit., p. 343.

sought to remove Mary from the throne and make Elizabeth the queen of England. While the Wyatt Rebellion was easily beaten down, the leader and over one hundred of his followers were executed for high treason. A Catholic historian called Wyatt's uprising a "rebellion of heretics from the diocese of Canterbury and Rochester." He named Ponet, a prominent Protestant, as one of the rebel leaders.[12]

Two years later, in 1555, a plan evolved to have a group of English émigrés living in France raid the royal treasury in England to finance another rebellion. The government struck before anything could come from the plot. These rebels, likewise, sought to place a Protestant back on the English throne.[13]

Other Protestants sought to block government-sponsored legislation for the restoration of Roman Catholicism legally. As members of the House of Commons these men fought the repeal of Edwardian religious legislation. In Mary's first Parliament there was a militant block of eighty members which voted against the crown. While the government bill to repeal nine acts of Edward's reign passed,[14] the government did not attempt to repeal earlier religious legislation passed under Henry VIII until the Protestant block no longer existed.[15]

Despite letters sent out to admonish electors to choose

---

[12]Hughes, op. cit., II, 201.

[13]Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 48.

[14]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXXIII, pp. 370-80.

[15]Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 48.

representatives "of the wise, grave, and catholic sort," the House of Commons in 1554 continued to resist legislation favoring Roman Catholicism. During that session of Parliament:

> A party of young hot-heads in the Commons who gathered at an eating house known as Arundel's . . . formed a Protestant opposition to resist all Catholic measures. They came near to defeating the government bill which Mary had most at heart, and then when another bill was read, directed against Protestant refugees abroad, they obtained the keys of the House, locked the doors, forced a decision, and rejected the bill.[16]

The crown sent out letters again before the next Parliament stating in the strongest language that "none but Catholics and none who are suspect" were eligible for election to the Commons.[17] In 1554 the Catholic leaders succeeded in obtaining a bill that made future opposition to religious measures in the House of Commons impossible. That bill revived the Heresy Act.[18]

While such legislation removed opposition in the Parliament, it never succeeded in winning over most of the citizens of the realm. The people of London, particularly, were never silenced from voicing their objections to some of the changes which were made. When the Roman Catholic Mass, for example, was introduced in London in 1553, it was greeted with riots. Catholic clergymen were jeered, and anti-Catholic demonstrations were held in the city.[19] Even the violent phase of the

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] J. E. Neale, The Elizabethan House of Commons (Oxford: Alden Press, 1949), p. 288.

[18] Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXXV, p. 384.

[19] Neale, Queen Elizabeth, pp. 31-47.

Counter-Reformation which began in 1555 failed to intimidate the people and silence them. Some of the Marian martyrs were cheered by the citizenry as the people witnessed the executions.[20]

The people were stirred up by the anti-Catholic literature that circulated illegally throughout Mary's reign. Much of this literature was smuggled into England from the Continent, where exiled Englishmen were busy at the printing presses. Some of the propaganda appears to have been directed by leaders of the anti-government movement living in the homeland.[21]

Some of the banned material was even found in the house of the queen's half-sister, Lady Elizabeth. In 1554 when that house was raided a "great coffer of seditious, anti-Catholic books and papers, ballads and caricatures" was found. Although Elizabeth escaped involvement, four of her retainers were imprisoned for possessing the literature. "Opposition to Mary's policy was constantly expressing itself in ballads, seditious speeches and plots."[22]

Most of the people conformed to the practices of the established Church, but there appears to have been little sincere commitment to Roman Catholicism. A Catholic member of the Venetian embassy after observing the religious situation

---

[20] Ibid., p. 47.

[21] A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603), Vol. VI of The Political History of England, ed. by William Hunt and Reginald Poole (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919), p. 147.

[22] Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 47.

for three years reported that the number of genuine Catholics among the people was very small. He wrote that he found no ardent Catholics among those less than thirty-five years of age.[23] Mary's government had done little to effect a Roman Catholic spiritual revival, and what was done "stirred not a breath of spiritual fervour."[24]

Time and circumstances were against the Counter-Reformation. Patriotic Englishmen resented the queen's marriage to a Spanish prince and the part he played in the affairs of state. The sight of Spanish soldiers, courtiers and clergymen in Philip's retinue repelled them. A disastrous war with France and the loss of Calais offended their national pride. The imposition of Roman Catholicism with its submission to a foreign power was distasteful to citizens who had until recently known a national church.[25] Such circumstances could not be countered by the religious leaders of the realm. For the most part the leadership of the Church of England was ineffective and some of it was suspect. Twelve of the bishops were appointees of Henry VIII, and their religious convictions were questioned, since they had earlier repudiated papal supremacy.[26] Even the effectiveness of Stephen Gardiner, the Lord Chancellor until his death on 13 November 1555, was blunted when one of

---

[23]Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 29.

[24]Pollard, op. cit., p. 173.

[25]Ibid., pp. 158-75.

[26]Hughes, op. cit., II, 329.

his treatises was published by his enemies. Gardiner had written a treatise denying papal supremacy during Henry's reign, and the anti-Catholic forces reprinted it during his chancellorship.[27]

Five important episcopal sees remained vacant during the latter stages of the Marian era. The queen's difficulties with Pope Paul IV prevented the filling of these sees, thereby depriving the Roman Catholic Church of supervision and leadership in those areas. Failure to provide leadership in those areas plus the ineffective leadership for the most part in other areas hindered the cause of the Roman Church. The only real spiritual stimulus of the age came from the forces opposing the Catholic Church in England.

The moderate phase of the Counter-Reformation ended with the passing of the heresy laws which went into effect on 20 January 1555. Before then, however, Stephen Gardiner had begun to hold preliminary examinations of the imprisoned Protestant leaders. Eight days before the statute became law Cardinal Pole, as the papal legate, issued a commission to the bishops and other ecclesiastics to try the accused. The leaders of the country probably expected the accused to recant. They "were quite unprepared for the strength of the spiritual forces which they encountered, and the first executions produced a shock which almost made them recoil."[28]

---

[27]Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 35.

[28]Pollard, op. cit., p. 135.

In other parts of Europe, particularly in Spain and in her dominions, persecution and death at the stake for religious reasons was a common practice.[29] Thousands died a martyr's death. About the same time that the Marian burnings began thirteen hundred dissidents were burned at the stake in nearby Holland. England, too, had known death at the stake for heresy; but nothing there ever approximated the persecution under Mary. "It was unique and it produced a unique impression. It stamped on the English mind a hatred, unthinking, ferocious, and almost indelible, of Rome and all its belongings."[30] Nearly three hundred men and women of all ages died in the flames.[31]

The prime movers behind the violent phase of the period were the queen and her husband, though the latter indirectly.[32] The queen had become embittered over the turn of events. She faced a hostile Parliament with members fighting to save their lands which had once been Church property. Mary's husband, for all practical purposes, had abandoned her and had returned to his lands of the Continent. Mary had no child and heir, and this fact tortured her. Her spiritual advisor was Bartolmę de Carranza, a man who later boasted of the inquisi-

---

[29]Henry Lea, A History of the Inquisition of Spain (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906), IV, 516-24.

[30]Pollard, op. cit., p. 157.

[31]The Acts and Monuments of John Fox: A New and Complete Edition: With A Preliminary Dissertation, By The Rev. George Townsend, M.A., ed. by Stephen Reed Cattley (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1837-41). Hereafter cited as Acts and Monuments.

[32]H. F. M. Prescott, Mary Tudor (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954), pp. 309-13.

tion he had conducted while in England.[33] Mary had nowhere to turn but to her faith for solace, and she was determined to advance Roman Catholicism in England and wipe out all resistance to it. Some of the responsibility must also rest on Mary's Council.

> The Council, had it been so minded could have prevented her from persecuting; it was not so minded, because members likely to adopt this view had been excluded by Mary from its ranks. It could not, moreover, had made her persecute against her will; of her will to persecute there can be no more doubt than there is of her sincerity. The fact that the burnings ceased at once on Mary's death measures the extent of her responsibility.[34]

Estimates of the number of Marian martyrs vary, but following a study by a Catholic historian who tends to minimize the event as much as he can, there were two hundred and seventy-three martyrs. Fifty-one were women. Twenty-one were clergymen. Five of the clergymen were bishops: Thomas Cranmer, Hugh Latimer, Nicholas Ridley, Robert Ferrar and John Hooper. Most of the executions took place in the greater London area and in the southeastern counties.[35]

The first Marian martyr was John Rogers who was burned at the stake on 4 February 1555. Witnessing the execution were members of Roger's family and a large number of spectators. The crowd's reaction to Roger's heroism caused the French ambassador to write: "It seemed as though he [Rogers] were being taken to his wedding."[36] Rogers set the pattern for

---

[33]Lea, op. cit., II, 49, 50.

[34]Pollard, op. cit., pp. 156, 157.

[35]Hughes, op. cit., II, 261-64.

[36]Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 47.

the other martyrs to follow. Offered a pardon while tied to the stake if he would recant, Rogers chose torture and death rather than to deny his faith.

Most of the other imprisoned Protestant leaders followed the example set by Rogers. Some like Holgate, the archbishop of York, did recant and were spared from the flames. Miles Coverdale was released when the Danish king interceded with Mary for him. Others died for their faith. Among these were John Hooper, Nicholas Ridley, John Bradford, Laurence Saunders, Rowland Taylor, John Philpot, Hugh Latimer, and Thomas Cranmer. The story of their trials, examinations and martyrdoms have become legendary among Protestants in English Church History. The account by John Foxe in his Book of the Martyrs became a classic soon after it was written.

It is possible to study the faith for which these men died from the transcripts of their trials and from the treatises they wrote while in prison. The accused men knew the gravity of the situation. Ridley expressed it for them when he wrote: "He would not willingly rush on death through tortures for a mistaken question or a point of little importance."[37] On the other hand he indicated that the men would not recant just to save their lives. "To die in Christ's cause is a high honor," he wrote, "to the which no man certainly shall or can aspire, but to whom God vouchsafeth that dignity."[38]

37"Conference between Ridley and Latimer," The Fathers of the English Church; Or, A Selection from the Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant Divines, of the Church of England (London: John Hatchard, 1808), IV, 80. n. *.

38Ibid.

The controverted doctrine of the day was still the Lord's Supper. The denial of the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation was deemed heresy, and heresy meant death at the stake. Ridley indicated that the accused leaders were of the same opinion on the Sacrament of the Altar. In his treatise on that Sacrament, he said:

> Thus hitherto, without all doubt, God is my witness, I say as far as I know, there is no controversy among them that be learned among the church of England, concerning the matter of the sacrament, but all do agree, whether they be old or new.[39]

Ridley's statement is probably true since the leaders were thrown into the same cell for a while, and they had opportunity to discuss their views on the Sacrament. Ridley expressed this common view writing:

> Briefly, they deny the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of his human and assumed nature, and grant the presence of the same by grace: that is, they affirm and say, that the substance of the natural body and blood is only remaining in heaven.[40]

Hugh Latimer echoed the view expressed by Ridley. When Latimer was asked by one of his examiners the question: "Of what meant Christ? His true flesh or no?" Latimer answered: "Of his true flesh, spiritually to be eaten, in the supper by faith, and not corporally."[41] In a debate at Oxford, Latimer defended his view stating:

---

[39]"A Treatise Against The Error Of Transubstantiation," The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D. Sometime Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555, ed. by Henry Christmas for the Parker Society (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1843), p. 12.

[40]Ibid., p. 13.

[41]"Disputation At Oxford Between Latimer And Smith," Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555, ed. by George Corrie for the Parker Society (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1845), p. 266.

> I say, that there is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence. . . . And the same presence may be called a real presence, . . . which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the anabaptists, to make nothing else of the sacrament but a bare and naked sign.[42]

These were the same views that these men held in the latter part of Edward VI's reign. They wanted to hold to a Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, but their concept of the Person of Christ kept them from holding to the Lutheran view. They insisted that the body and blood of Christ were received only by the true believer and not by the wicked. This was the view of Martin Bucer, Henry Bullinger and John Calvin. The human nature of Christ, these divines maintained, was in heaven; and consequently could not be present in the Sacrament.

The same Calvinist view of the Lord's Supper was echoed by John Bradford. Although not a bishop, Bradford assumed the leadership of the imprisoned Protestant leaders. Bradford was imprisoned early in the reign of Mary for his preaching against transubstantiation. Like the others, Bradford denied the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament and held only to a spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ by the true believer.[43]

Another Marian martyr whose views have been preserved was John Philpot, an archdeacon of the Church of England during

---

[42] Ibid., p. 252. Footnotes, brackets and markings removed.

[43] "The Last Examination," The Writings of John Bradford, ed. for the Parker Society by Aubrey Townsend (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1848), p. 311.

the reign of Edward VI. Philpot indicated the extent to which Calvinist thought had penetrated the Church of England. Philpot willingly called himself a follower of John Calvin in respect to the Sacrament of the Altar. He told an examiner trying him:

> I allow the church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same for it is one, catholic, and apostolic, and doth teach the doctrine the Apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward's days was the same.[44]

While the Marian martyrs were testifying to their faith by their martyrdom, other Englishmen were testifying to their faith from the safety of a foreign refuge. The first Marian exiles left England when the Protestant leaders were arrested. They joined the members of the foreign churches, the foreigners' pastors, and the invited theologians in the exodus. They were unmolested in their departure; in fact the crown was glad to be rid of them. A study made of the exodus concludes:

> The character of the exodus would in itself seem to preclude any possibility that flight was haphazard or precipitate. Mary and her religious leaders were glad to be rid of these exiles.[45]

All in all about eight hundred Englishmen left the country. Before leaving, the exiles had made arrangements for places where they could stay and for necessary financial support. While the number was small, the exiles came from some of the most prominent families of England and their influence was far greater than the size would indicate.

Only one group of exiles appears to have been able to

---

[44]Foxe, Acts And Monuments, XI, 864-89.

[45]Christina Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1938), p. 11.

find gainful employment while on the Continent. These Englishmen settled at first in Lutheran Wesel. When the town officials became concerned about their political activities, the English were forced to leave. The group eventually settled in Aarau in Switzerland.[46]

Another group settled in Lutheran Emden. These exiles appear to have been particularly active in printing Protestant literature for shipment back to England.[47]

In general, the Marian exiles tended to settle in centers of Reformed theology. This was usually by choice, since they had already established good relations with the leaders of the Reformed Churches who earlier had assisted them during the Edwardian period. The exiles found little welcome in Lutheran centers. Strype goes even farther and says:

> . . . the exile English were much hated by those of that profession because they looked upon them as Sacramentaries, and holding as Calvin and Peter Martin did in the doctrine of the sacrament. Therefore when any English came among them for shelter, they expelled them out of their cities.[48]

---

[46]Frederick Norwood, The Reformation Refugees As an Economic Force (Chicago: The American Society Of Church History, 1942), p. 176.

[47]Harold J. Grimm, The Reformation Era 1500-1650 (New York: Macmillan Co., 1954), p. 463.

[48]John Strype, Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury Wherein the History of the Church and the Reformation of It, During the Primacy of the Said Archbishop, Are Greatly Illustrated; and many Singular Matters relating thereunto now first published (1694). In Three Books. Collected Chiefly From Records, Registers, Authentic Letters, And Other Original Manuscripts. A New Edition, With Additions. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1812), I, 507.

The fact that the Marian exiles settled in areas where Calvinist theology dominated had important ramifications for the subsequent Elizabethan Era. In such centers the exiles had the opportunity to read and to study Calvin's writings, to observe the practices of the Reformed Churches, and to imbibe the spirit of the people. An important fact is that nearly two hundred exiles, one-fourth of the group, settled in Geneva itself. While there, these Englishmen lived under the discipline of the Genevan Church, grew to like it, and were determined to introduce a similar system in the English Church when they would be permitted to return.[49]

The English were not without their squabbles on the Continent. The congregation in Frankfurt, which found refuge by sharing a building with an exile French congregation shepherded by Valerand Poullain, was particularly involved in a serious problem. The group had agreed to abide by the practices of the French Reformed Church, which was Genevan in character.[50] When later exiles joined them, the congregation split over the question of whether to continue to observe the practices prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. The issue was not settled until John Knox, whom the congregation had called for its pastor, was advised to resign. Knox and those committed to the Genevan order finally left and settled in Geneva.

---

[49]J. E. Neale, Essays in Elizabethan History (Oxford: Alden Press, 1958), p. 54.

[50]William Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service Book (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1931), p. 8.

The Frankfurt congregation then chose Richard Cox as its pastor and adopted an Interim Order of Service.[51] Members of the Frankfurt Church later wanted this form adopted by the Church of England. The English who settled in Geneva were never satisfied with the order of service that eventually became part of the Elizabethan Prayer Book. The Genevan Service Book which Knox devised remained their ideal.

Some of the Marian exiles worked on projects of major importance for English Calvinists. Their most important publication was the first edition of the Geneva Bible.[52] Some of the men who worked on the book considered its completion so important that they delayed returning to England even after it was safe for them to do so. Among the editors were Whittingham, Sampson, Coverdale, Cole and Gilby.[53] They were advised by John Calvin and Theodore Beza, Calvin's successor.[54] The work would have been important were it but a Bible translation.

---

[51]Frederick J. Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation (London: James Clark and Co., n.d.), p. 93.

[52]The Bible: translated according to the Hebrew and Greeke, and conferred with the best translations in divers languages: with most profitable annotations upon all the hard places, and other things of great importance as may apeare in the epistle to the reader. And also a most profitable concordance for the ready finding out of anything in the same contained (London: Robert Barker, 1615).

[53]John Strype, Annals of the Reformation and the Establishment of Religion and Other Various Occurences in the Church of England during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1824), I. i. 343.

[54]Charles Butterworth, The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible (1340-1611) (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941), p. 65.

However, the Geneva Bible has copious marginal notes. These annotations permit a possible Calvinist interpretation. The first edition was published in 1560 and was dedicated to Queen Elizabeth. The Geneva Bible became particularly popular among later Puritans. While permission to have it published in England was later granted, the version never received official sanctions due to the annotations.[55]

On 17 November 1558 the exiles were free to return to England. Mary died that day of a lingering illness together "with mental anxieties that plagued her more than her disease."[56] Within a few hours of her death, the papal legate and the head of the English Church, Cardinal Pole, died. With them ended the Counter-Reformation.

Bishop White's funeral sermon for Mary prophesied what was to come. "The wolves," he said, "be coming out of Geneva and other places of Germany and hath sent their books before, full of pestilent doctrines, blasphemy, and heresy to infect the people."[57] "The wolves" to whom Bishop White referred were the clergymen and the laymen who had spent years of exile in Calvinist centers on the Continent. While there they had impatiently waited for the day when it would be safe for them to return to England. There they had studied and worked, and they were eager to share their theology with the people in

---

[55] Ibid., p. 172.

[56] Hughes, op. cit., II, 329.

[57] Neale, Queen Elizabeth, p. 57.

their homeland. Among them were some of the future bishops, deans and instructors in the universities of the Church of England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I.

The people of England were ready for them. The Counter-Reformation had turned them against the Roman Catholic Church. A positive theology was needed to fill the vacuum that existed. The dominant theology of the day was Calvinist, and it was to this that some of the English divines turned for guidance. While the terms Calvinist and Calvinism do not come into popular usage until several decades later, the spirit of Calvin and his theology were well known.

CHAPTER V

THE REINTRODUCTION OF CALVINISM INTO THE FORMULARIES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH DURING THE EARLY YEARS OF THE REIGN OF QUEEN ELIZABETH 1558-1562

Parliament was in session when Mary died on 17 November 1558. Since Cardinal Pole died that same day, the archbishop of York, Nicholas Heath, as the leading prelate, proclaimed Elizabeth I the queen of England. By law, Parliament was immediately dissolved. This was the last Parliament to meet under a Roman Catholic queen. Future Parliaments met under a queen favorable to Protestantism.

During the long reign of Elizabeth I (queen from 17 November 1558 to 24 March 1603) England once again became a Protestant land as much as legislation and official formularies could make her one. Roman Catholic doctrine and formularies restored by Queen Mary were replaced. Royal supremacy once again replaced papal supremacy in the Church of England. Injunctions, proclamations and legislation to effect the change during the years 1558 to 1562 include: Queen Elizabeth's Proclamation To Forbid Preaching, Etc., A.D. 1558; The Injunctions of Elizabeth, A.D. 1559; Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, Restoring Ancient Jurisdiction, A.D. 1559; and Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, A.D. 1559.

The formularies used in the era include: The Litany And Suffrages of 1558; The Litany Used in the Queen's Majesty's Chapel in 1559; The Book of Common Prayer And Administration

of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England of 1559; Godly Prayers of 1559; The Form and Manner of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons of 1559; Liber Precum Publicarum, seu ministerii Ecclesiasticae administrationis Sacramentorum, aliorumque rituum et caeremoniarum in Ecclesia Anglicana in 1560; In Commendationibus Benefactorum in 1560; The Primer of 1559; The Orarum of 1560; The Celebratio Coenae Domini In Fuebribus of 1560; The New Calendar of 1561; A List of Occasional Forms of Prayer and Services of 1560; A Short Form and Order for seasonal weather, and good success of the Common affairs of the Realm of 1560; and A Prayer for the present estate in the churches of 1562. Another formulary of great importance, which while it did not receive Parliament's stamp of approval until 1571, was the Thirty-Nine Articles passed by Convocation and revised in 1562. The latter formulary and the Elizabethan Prayer Book are of particular importance in a study of the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England during the early years of Elizabeth's reign. Of some importance also as an unofficial formulary was Matthew Parker's Eleven Articles of 1559. The latter articles were approved by the bishops for subscription by all the clergy.

The chief figure in the reintroduction of Protestantism into England was Queen Elizabeth herself. As a Tudor monarch she had the power to dictate the program she wanted and to

veto legislation she disliked.[1] Her principal assistants were bishops, led by Matthew Parker, her first archbishop of Canterbury. Parker, however, did not take part in the first Parliament. Her chief political leaders were the members of her Council, led by her principal Secretary, William Cecil.

The theologian to whom the English divines of the era looked for guidance and inspiration was the late Thomas Cranmer. His work survived the Counter-Reformation and again found its way into the formularies of the Church of England. As will be indicated, much of the theological and literary work of the martyred archbishop was used wholesale in the important confessions and orders of service of the Elizabethan Age.

When Elizabeth I became queen, the Church of England was Roman Catholic by law, by theology and by ritual. Repressive laws against Protestants were the law of the land. The Marian Era had repealed all religious legislation dating from 1528. Protestant formularies of the Edwardian reign had been removed and had been replaced by Roman Catholic Breviaries, Missals and other forms. Every occupied Church post and chair of theology at the English universities was held by a Roman Catholic.

Elizabeth's accession to the throne was correctly interpreted by the people and by the leaders as the beginning of a different era. Although the queen masked her personal religious sympathies for a while for political reasons, it soon

---

[1] J. E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments (1559-1581) (Oxford: Alden Press, 1933), p. 82. Hereafter cited as Elizabeth I.

became evident that a national church would be restored as the religion of the land.[2] Protestants driven underground began to emerge, and those forced into exile began to return to their homeland. There they quickly made their presence felt.

The divisive doctrine of the day remained the Sacrament of the Altar. On 27 October 1558 the Catholic bishops protested the open attacks on the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to the Sacrament. They presented Five Articles defending the legally official teaching of transubstantiation.[3] The next day Elizabeth issued a proclamation which forbade all preaching and debate on the controversial doctrine.[4] Until the matter was settled by Parliament, clergymen were also limited to the forms approved by law. A few minor changes were ordered. English was to be permitted in the reading of parts of the service. In addition to the official forms, clergymen were allowed to use a Litany used by the queen in her private

---

[2]A. F. Pollard, The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603), Vol. VI of The Political History of England, ed. by William Hunt and Reginald Poole (London: Longmans, Green And Co., 1919), pp. 186-92.

[3]John Strype, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, And Other Various Occurences in the Church of England, during Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, And Letters (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1824), I. i. 81.

[4]Henry Gee and William Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History Compiled From Original Sources (London: Macmillan And Co., Ltd., 1896), no. LXXVII, pp. 416, 417.

chapel.[5] This Litany is similar to The Litany And Suffrages[6] first used on 1 January 1559. The former contained prayers for various occasions, The Lord's Prayer, The Creed, The Ten Commandments, and Table Prayers. The latter contained a prayer with the words "from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities,"[7] words not found in the Litany used by the queen. A study of the Litany proper indicates that it was taken from Henry's Primer of 1547[8] or the Primer of 1545.[9] "It appears not unreasonable to suppose the composition of the work to have proceeded originally from Cranmer."[10] Thus the work of the martyred archbishop begins once again to find its way into the official formularies of the Church of England. The phrase found in The Litany And Suffrages which distinguishes

---

[5]"The Litany, Used In The Queen's Majesty's Chapel, According To The Tenor Of The Proclamation," Liturgical Services, Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. by William Clay for the Parker Society (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1847), pp. 9-22. Hereafter cited as Liturgical Services.

[6]"The Litany And Suffrages," Liturgical Services, pp. 1-8.

[7]Ibid., p. 4.

[8]"An Exhortation Unto Prayer, Thought Meet By The King's Majesty, And His Clergy, To Be Read To The People In Every Church Before Processions. Also, A Litany With Suffrages, To Be Said Or Sung In The Time Of The Said Processions," Private Prayers, Put Forth by Authority during the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Primer of 1559. The Orarum of 1560. The Preces Privatae of 1564. The Book of Christian Prayers of 1578. With An Appendix, Containing the Litany of 1544, ed. by William Clay for the Parker Society (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1846), pp. vii. Hereafter cited as Private Prayers.

[9]"Preface," Liturgical Services, p. ix.

[10]Ibid., p. xxiv.

it from the Litany also indicates the pressure reformers were bringing to bear for the establishment of a national Church of England.

The queen's coronation took place on 15 January 1559. Ten days later Elizabeth's first Parliament was called to order. Although the reason for the calling of Parliament was financial, the main issue of the session was religious.[11] The government anticipated the trouble Parliament would have in settling the religious issue. Nicholas Bacon, the Keeper of the Great Seal, gave the opening address and called upon the members of both houses to exercise moderation. "The voice was the voice of Bacon, but the hand was the hand of Elizabeth."[12]

Opposition from the Catholic spiritual lords was voiced early in the session. The restoration of a First Fruits Bill triggered Roman Catholic reaction. The nine prelates voted to reject the bill. As other bills to change the religious climate were voted upon, the Catholic bishops "to a man voted against every ecclesiastical bill."[13] No attempt was made to deprive the Catholic bishops of their offices. They were removed only after legislation was passed to which they refused to subscribe. That legislation was not passed until the end of the session.

---

[11]Carl S. Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559 (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), p. 23.

[12]Ibid., p. 26.

[13]Neale, Elizabeth I, p. 41.

During the Easter recess of Parliament the Catholic leaders were forced to debate their views with Protestant divines. The Westminster Disputation was concerned with three questions. One was the language to be used in the worship services, the second was concerned about ritual, and the third was on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[14] The statements made during the debate by the Protestant champions indicate that they were Calvinists and Puritans. The question of ceremonies illustrated some of the problems the House of Commons, the House of Lords, and the crown were having in coming to a religious agreement.

The session of Parliament held before Easter failed to produce religious legislation acceptable to all parties. Due to the impasse, Elizabeth issued a proclamation regarding Holy Communion. The queen's order, dated 22 March 1559, permitted Englishmen to commune on Easter Sunday receiving both the bread and wine in a rite to be spoken in English. The proclamation avoided touching on the doctrine involved in the Sacrament.[15]

When Parliament reconvened, the major legislation that effected the religious settlement was passed. These two bills were Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, Restoring Ancient Jurisdiction, A.D. 1559[16] and Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, A.D. 1559.[17] The first bill made England a non-Roman Catholic country again

---

[14]Strype, Elizabeth, I, i, 131-34.

[15]Neale, Elizabeth I, p. 67.

[16]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXXIX, pp. 442-58.

[17]Ibid., no. LXXX, pp. 458-67.

and established a national Church. The second bill established the Elizabethan Prayer Book as the formulary to be used in all English churches. The queen was declared to be "the only supreme governor of this realm . . . as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical causes, as temporal."[18] Calvinism re-entered the Church through a possible Calvinist interpretation of the Lord's Supper in the formulary approved.

The Elizabethan Prayer Book has the proper title: The Book of Common Prayer, And Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies in the Church of England,[19] a title similar to Edward's. The religious settlement reached through this formulary does not reflect the bitter opposition of a radical group to its adoption. An historian who has carefully studied the proceedings of the Parliament that passed the enabling legislation wrote: "The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Act of Uniformity were extorted by pressure of the Marian exiles, backed by a House of Commons under the leadership of radical Protestant devotees."[20]

The Elizabethan Prayer Book was the re-issuing of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Very few changes were made. There was one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be read every Sunday, a change in the Litany with the deletion of the phrase "from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and all

---

[18] Ibid., no. LXXIX, p. 449.

[19] Liturgical Services, pp. 23-255.

[20] J. E. Neale, Essays in Elizabethan History (Oxford: Alden Press, 1958), p. 25.

his detestable enormities," and two sentences were added to the delivery of the Sacrament. Kneeling to receive the Sacrament was not mentioned. Changes were later made to add this rubric. A New Calendar was later added, a change was made in some of the lessons, a collect was changed, and some verbal additions were later made in later editions.[21]

Since the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was a key issue, the words added to the delivery of the elements to the communicant are important for a study of the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England. The wording used in the Elizabethan Prayer Book is:

> The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, feed on Him in thine heart by faith, with thanksgiving. . . . The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life; and drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.[22]

The words chosen were taken from both of the forms used during the reign of Edward VI. The first part of each formula would appear to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence. The second part would appear to teach the Calvinist doctrine of a spiritual eating and drinking.

The new Prayer Book retained the prayer used for the elements which was found in the Prayer Book of 1552.[23] Calvinists had expressed no objections to the prayer when it was first

---

[21]"Preface," The Two Liturgies, pp. xii-xv.

[22]The Two Liturgies, p. 195.

[23]Supra, p. 73.

published. Its retention in the Elizabethan Prayer Book would tend to indicate that a Calvinist interpretation should be placed on the words used. The bare wording, however, gives no clue as to the intended interpretation.

The Prayer Book of 1559 was a compromise between the crown and the committee charged with the responsibility of drawing up the formulary. Elizabeth indicated her desire to have the Prayer Book of 1549 re-issued. The committee wanted the Prayer Book of 1552.[24] The religious settlement consisted of the crown's agreement to use the Second Prayer Book and the committee's agreement to accept a few revisions. The compromise failed to satisfy a large number of Protestant members of the House of Commons. A solid core of about ninety rejected the proposal.[25] Many of these Protestants opposed the retention of prescribed rites and ceremonies in the Church of England. The queen refused to go along with the dissident faction. The Second Prayer Book with the revisions as noted and the deletion of the Black Rubric became the official formulary and the rule of the Church of England. The Calvinists had failed in their attempt to simplify the worship services.

Issued about the same time were the Injunctions of Elizabeth, A.D. 1559.[26] These Injunctions appear to have been drawn up by the revisers of the Prayer Book. The basis for

---

[24]Strype, Elizabeth, Appendix, No. XIV, I, ii, 459-64.

[25]Neale, Elizabeth I, pp. 55-58.

[26]Gee and Hardy, Documents, no. LXXVIII, pp. 417-42.

the Injunctions is the series of Injunctions published under Edward VI in 1547. As such they also represent the work of Thomas Cranmer. Some additions were made to the earlier orders. While the Injunctions permitted priests to marry, as did the earlier legislation of Edward VI, such priests were ordered to first consult with their bishop. The decrees also prescribed clerical garb, an injunction the Puritans disliked. The question of ceremonies was appearing to overshadow all other religious issues of the day.

Among the books prescribed for use in the Church was the Primer.[27] This form was a book of private prayers, and in the main it was a reprint of either the Primer of 1551 or that of 1552.[28] Both of those books were based on an earlier Primer Thomas Cranmer had drawn up for Henry VIII. In Elizabeth's Primer prayers were recommended to the communicant before and after receiving the Sacrament. In the prayer before communion some of the words read: ". . . grant us therefore gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood. . . ."[29] In the recommended prayer after communion these words are found: ". . . we . . . thank thee, that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, . . . with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour

---

[27]"The Primer set forth at large, with many godly and devout prayers, Anno. 1559," Private Prayers, pp. 1-114.

[28]"Preface," Private Prayers, p. x.

[29]"A prayer to be said before receiving of the holy communion," Private Prayers, p. 13.

Jesus Christ."[30] In the Primer, as in the Prayer Book, the words are inconclusive as to whether the doctrine of the Real Presence is maintained or the Calvinist doctrine of a spiritual eating and drinking.

The Injunctions of 1559 also prescribed that a Catechism be taught to the children in the schools of England. That Catechism is found in The Orarum of 1560.[31] The latter formulary is a Latin form of private prayers similar to those used during the reign of Henry VIII. Basically it is a book of daily devotions.[32] The Catechism of The Orarum was intended as an examination of confirmands. There is nothing in the questions and answers about the Sacrament of the Altar which would indicate any inroads of Calvinist doctrine into the English Church.

The other formularies that were "set forth by authority" about the same time include these as they bear their shorter titles: Godly Prayers,[33] Prayers,[34] The Form and Manner of Making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,[35]

---

[30]"A prayer to be said after receiving of the holy communion," Private Prayers, p. 15.

[31]Private Prayers, pp. 126-44.

[32]"Preface," Private Prayers, p. xii.

[33]Liturgical Services, pp. 246-57.

[34]Ibid., pp. 258-71.

[35]Ibid., pp. 272-98.

The New Calendar,[36] Celebratio Coenae Domini in Fuebribus,[37] and A List of Occasional Forms of Prayer and Services.[38] There appears to be nothing controversial in any of these forms for their use among Protestants. Another form that was authorized about the same time was a Latin version of the Prayer Book. That book was titled Liber Precum Publicarum, seu ministerii Ecclesiasticae administrationis Sacramentorum, aliorumque rituum et caeremoniarum.[39] Since the Latin version gives the same meaning as the English version, nothing conclusive can be said about the wording used for the Lord's Supper as to whether a Lutheran or a Calvinist interpretation should be placed on the doctrine. The Latin form was intended for use in the schools of England and for the non-English speaking world.[40]

Matthew Parker attempted to give a theological foundation to the re-established national Church. In 1559 he drew up a statement of faith in Eleven Articles.[41] The confession was intended to bring peace and harmony back to the Church. Some of the clergymen were very outspoken in condemning the continued use of rites and ceremonies in the worship services. Some even

---

[36] Ibid., pp. 435-36.

[37] Ibid., pp. 437-56.

[38] Ibid., pp. 457-74.

[39] Ibid., pp. 299-431.

[40] "Preface," Liturgical Services, p. xxiii.

[41] Strype, Elizabeth, I., i., 327-29.

drew up a confession of their own defending their position. They presented it to defend themselves from being called heretics and to express their loyalty to the queen even though they disagreed with her on the matter of rites and ritual.[42]

The Eleven Articles is a rather short doctrinal statement, consisting of a preface and the articles proper. The articles express a faith in the true God; the acknowledgement that Scripture must be the source of all teaching in the Church; a subscription to the three ecumenical creeds; a statement that the Church has the right to prescribe or alter ceremonies; a statement on the office of the holy ministry; submission to the queen in all matters "to be agreeable to God's word"; that communion should be in both kinds; a denial of the claim of the papacy; the acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer to be "agreeable to the Scriptures"; and that sacramentals used in Holy Baptism, private masses, and the superstitious use of images in churches are wrong.

The Eleven Articles say nothing about the Lord's Supper except that it should be under the forms of bread and wine, a position to which Protestants of all persuasions subscribed. The only controversial article was the one dealing with the question of ceremonies. Parker had a personal dislike for their retention in the worship services. Earlier he had written to the queen about his feelings on the matter.[43] In the

---

[42]Ibid., I., i., 166-73.

[43]Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D. Archbishop of Canterbury Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from

Eleven Articles Parker repeated his position against their retention, although he conceded that the Church had the right to retain them.

The chief doctrinal formulary of the early years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth I was the Thirty-Nine Articles of 1559.[44] These articles were later revised and were adopted by the English clergy in 1562. They received Parliament approval in 1571. The formulary was primarily a revision of the Forty-Two Articles of 1552, which Cranmer had drawn up to serve as a theological basis for the Edwardian Reformation. Once again that formulary was used to provide part of the theological basis for the re-establishment of a national Church.

During the interim between the drafting of the two formularies, additional Confessions had been drawn up by the various religious communions. Hardwick suggests that Matthew Parker based his revision of Cranmer's earlier articles upon a Lutheran Confession presented at Trent in 1552 known as the Wuerttemburg Confession.[45] England was toying with the idea of a political alliance with the Schmalkaldic League at the time the Thirty-Nine Articles were being drafted. In order to curry Lutheran favor, Hardwick suggests that the English

---

A.D. 1535, to His Death, A.D. 1575, ed. for the Parker Society by John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1853), Letter LXVI, pp. 79-95.

[44]Charles Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion: To Which Is Added a Series of Documents, from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615; Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources (London: George Bell & Son, 1881), Appendix III.

[45]Ibid., pp. 124-28.

divines made use of the new Lutheran Confession. Peter Martyr is quoted as being upset because the English Church did not use one of the Helvetic Confessions.[46]

Some changes were made in the new formulary. Four of Cranmer's articles were dropped, four were added, and seventeen were modified. One of the articles in the Latin edition has been the subject of speculation. This is Article XXIX dealing with the question whether the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. Parker's copy does not have this article. A number of other copies do. Hardwick says that the article was not printed in the first edition. His comments suggest that the article was adopted by the clergy, and that the oversight of printing it was corrected when Parliament passed upon the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1571.[47]

This article and the preceding one on the Sacrament of the Altar are important in a study of the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the established Church. The two articles in the 1571 English edition have the subtitles: "Of the Lordes Supper" and "Of the wicked which do not eate of the body of Christe in the use of the Lordes Supper." Article XXVIII has this wording:

> The Supper of the Lord is not only a signe of the loue that Christians ought to hauve among them selues one to another; but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christes death. Insomuch that to suche as ryghtlie, worthyly, and with fayth receaue the same the bread which we breake is a parttakying of the body

---

[46] Ibid., p. 124.

[47] Ibid., p. 128.

> of Christe, and likewyse the cuppe of blessing is a parttakying of the blood of Christe.
>
> Transubstantiation (or the chaunge of the substaunce of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lorde, can not be proued by holye writ, but is repugnaunt to the playne wordes of scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath giuen occasion to many superstitions.
>
> The body of Christe is giuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall manner: And the meane whereby the body of Christe is receaued and eaten in the Supper.[48]

Article XXIX has this wording in the English text of 1571:

> The wicked, and such as be voyde of a lively fayth, although they do carnally and visibly presse with their teeth (as Saint Augustine sayth) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: yet in no wyse are the [y] partakers of Christe, but rather to their condemnation, do eate and drinke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.[49]

These articles follow the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and they indicate the influence that Calvinist thought had at the time upon English Church leaders. The Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence cannot be found in the wording used, and the Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation is specifically condemned. Since the English leaders rejected the concept of the ubiquity of Christ, they had turned to the Swiss mediating theologians for the formulation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Martin Bucer had earlier suggested to Matthew Parker that terms like "substantially," "carnally," and "really" should be avoided. Bucer told Parker, "Just insist that the believer does receive the body and blood of

---

[48] Ibid., Appendix III, pp. 329-31.

[49] Ibid., Appendix III, pp. 331-33.

Christ."[50] Parker followed that advice when he drew up the wording on the Lord's Supper for the Thirty-Nine Articles. Bucer in turn was in agreement with John Calvin on the controverted doctrine as Bucer's subscription to the Tigurine Confession indicated.[51]

At the same time that the clergy of England subscribed to the Thirty-Nine Articles, Convocation also approved the publication of a Catechism. The one chosen had been written by Alexander Nowell, the Dean of St. Paul's Church. Nowell was asked to submit his Catechism for approval. He did so and followed the suggestions made in revising it. This Catechism was then authorized by Convocation.[52] William Cecil, however, refused to have the Catechism printed until 1570. This book of instruction for children also helped to acquaint the English Church with some of the teachings of John Calvin. Nowell admitted the dependence of his work on the work of others. He said that he "had not scrupled to avail himself of the labors of those who had preceded him both as regard arrangement and matter."[53] "The Catechism of Poinet and Calvin are perhaps those with which Nowell's most frequently

---

[50]V. J. K. Brook, A Life of Archbishop Parker (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 44.

[51]Ibid., p. 44, n. 1.

[52]A Catechism Written in Latin by Alexander Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's: Together with the Same Catechism Translated into English by Thomas Norton, ed. for the Parker Society by G. E. Corrie (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1853). Hereafter cited as Nowell's Catechism.

[53]"Preface," Nowell's Catechism, p. vii.

and verbally coincided."[54] In this work the ubiquity of Christ is also denied.[55]

Cecil's action in holding up Nowell's Catechism illustrates the role the queen's principal Secretary played in the religious scene. As the spokesman for the crown, Cecil represented Elizabeth's views in dealing with the English divines. As with his action in posing the questions of the crown to Edmund Guest and Guest's committee to prevent the removal of some of the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Church, so with Nowell's Catechism the Secretary indicated his conservative position.

Nowell's Catechism was the last formulary accepted by the English clergy in the early years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The teachings of this Catechism on the Lord's Supper indicate that the English Church was committed to a Calvinist interpretation of the disputed Sacrament. Other aspects of Calvinism were not the issue of the day, excepting perhaps Calvin's moderate views on ceremonies. Elizabeth's Ornaments Rubric was undoubtedly to the Geneva divine's disliking, but Calvin did not advocate the disruption of the Church of England on that account. Questions concerning the doctrine of election arose later.

What had been accomplished generally met the approval of English Calvinist leaders. John Jewel, who later wrote the great defence of the Anglican settlement, indicated this in a letter to Peter Martyr dated 16 November 1559. Jewel

---

[54] Ibid., p. v.

[55] Nowell's Catechism, p. 215.

said: "The doctrine is everywhere most pure, but as to ceremonial maskings, there is a little too much foolery."[56]

---

[56]The Zurich Letters, Comprising The Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, With Some of the Helvetian Reformers, during the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, ed. for the Parker Society by Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1842), p. 55, ep. IV.

CONCLUSION

The burden of this thesis was to trace the introduction of Calvinism into the formularies of the Church of England. The time period covered was a twenty-eight year span which began in 1534 and which ended in 1562. The terminus a quo was chosen because it was in that year that the Church of England became a national Church and John Calvin identified himself with the cause of the Reformed Church. The terminus a quem was chosen because in 1562 the English Church adopted the Thirty-Nine Articles, a confession which clearly reveals the influence of Reformed theology on the Anglican corpus doctrinae and marks for all practical purposes the completion of the Elizabethan settlement.

Reformed theology arose from two distinct but similar expressions of Protestantism. The first was led by Ulrich Zwingli who confined his work for the most part to German speaking Switzerland. The second was championed by John Calvin who was particularly active in French speaking Switzerland. The Church that was shaped by Zwingli became attached to the Church which emerged under the direction of the Geneva divine. The connecting links between the two causes were the mediating theologians who modified the theology of Zwingli. Numbered among these divines were Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr and Henry Bullinger. These religious leaders were considered Calvin's heralds rather than his rivals.

Calvinism was defined as a distinctive doctrine in

contention, which was espoused by John Calvin. The methodology used was the selection of the divisive doctrine of the day, the Lord's Supper. Protestant leaders were agreed on most of the religious tenents which differentiated their cause from Roman Catholicism. They failed to agree on an interpretation of the Lord's Supper which all parties would accept. The acceptance by the English Church of that view of the Sacrament advocated by John Calvin and his co-laborers served to indicate the influence the Geneva divine had on the formularies adopted by the Anglican Church.

One problem faced was the identification of a particular doctrine as being Calvinist. Calvinism and the Church of England as a national Church grew side by side. Calvin's influence was in the main indirect. The men most responsible for influencing English Church leaders were the continental theologians who accepted the invitation to go to England to assist in the Reformation of the English Church. Three men appear to have been most influential in changing English religious opinion. They were Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr and John à Lasco. These mediating theologians made their presence in England felt when English divines were busy drawing up the formularies of the Edwardian period. The identification of their influence has been labelled Calvinist, although technically it might also be called Reformed or Swiss.

The most influential English divine during the period covered by the thesis was Thomas Cranmer. Evidence would tend to indicate that prior to 1548 Cranmer held to a Lutheran

view of the Sacrament. Towards the end of 1548 Cranmer appears to have changed his mind, and he accepted the view of the mediating theologians. Cranmer's views, however, remain the chief problem for a student of the era. While his writings reveal that he personally held to a Reformed view of the Sacrament of the Altar, the wording he chose for the English formularies tends to be somewhat ambiguous.

During the Marian Age a number of influential Englishmen settled in continental cities where Reformed theology dominated Church life and thought. Some came into direct contact with John Calvin and the Church of Geneva. They were enthused with what they saw and with the way of life they lived while there. Some of these Englishmen grew in their determination to introduce a similar pattern in the English Church. During the same era the actions of the crown in trying to force Roman Catholicism on the populace backfired. The Counter-Reformation succeeded only in helping to pave the way for the restoration of Protestantism in the next era.

When Queen Elizabeth ascended the English throne, religious forces went to work to restore the Protestant confessions and forms of worship of the Edwardian era. The struggle between the crown and the religious partisans resulted in a religious settlement whereby most of the Edwardian formularies were reinstated. The crown, however, insisted on certain modifications. The Elizabethan Prayer Book as a result contains some ambiguous statements on the Lord's Supper.

The Thirty-Nine Articles was the main formulary of the

Elizabethan period covered by the thesis. In this confession a Swiss or Calvinist view of the Lord's Supper is clearly taught.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Bible, The [Geneva] That Is, The holy Scriptures conteined in the Olde and Newe Testament, Translated According to the Ebrew and Greeke, and conferred with the best translations in divers languages. With most profitable Annotations upon all the hard places, and other things of great importance. London: Christopher Barker, 1599.

Bradford, John. The Writings of. Edited by Aubrey Townsend. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1848.

Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. With Introduction and Notes by John T. McNeill. Library of Christian Classics. Vols. XX, XXI. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.

-----. Theological Treatises. Edited by J. K. S. Reid. Library of Christian Classics. Vol. XXII. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Edited by H. J. Schroeder. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.

[Cranmer, Thomas, et al.] Certain Sermons Or Homilies Appointed by the King's Majesty to Be Declared and Read by All Parsons, Vicars and Curates, Every Sunday in Their Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth; and Reprinted by Authority from King James I A.D. 1623 to Which Are Added the Constitution and Canons of the Church of England, Set Forth A.D. 1603 with an Appendix Containing the Articles of Religion, Constitutions, and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. The Third American from the Last English Edition. Philadelphia: Edward Biddle, 1844.

-----. Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of. Edited by John Cox. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1846.

-----. Writings and Disputations of Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Edited by John Cox. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844.

Gee, Henry and Hardy, William. Documents Illustrative of English Church History Compiled from Original Sources. London: Macmillan And Co., Ltd., 1896.

Hardwick, Charles. A History of the Articles of Religion: to Which Is Added a Series of Documents, from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615; Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources. London: George Bell & Son, 1881.

Henry VIII. The King's Book Or, A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for Any Christian Man, 1534 with an Introduction by T. A. Lacey. London: SPCK, 1932.

Hooper, John. Early Writings of, D.D. Late Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Martyr 1555. Edited by Samuel Carr. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1843.

-----. Later Writings of Together with His Letters and Other Places. Edited by Charles Nevinson. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1852.

Latimer, Hugh. Sermons by, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555. Edited by George Corrie. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844.

-----. Sermons and Remains of, Sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555. Edited by George Corrie. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1845.

Liturgical Services, Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer Set Forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by William Clay. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1847.

Nowell, Alexander. A Catechism Written in Latin by, Dean of St. Paul's: Together with the Same Catechism Translated into English by Thomas Norton. Edited by G. E. Corrie. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1853.

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Written During the Reign of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary: Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich. Translated From Authenticated Copies of the Autographs, and Edited for the Parker Society, by the Rev. Hastings Robinson. The First Portion. The Second Portion. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1846, 1847.

Parker, Matthew. Correspondence of, D.D. Archbishop of Canterbury Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D. 1535, to His Death, A.D. 1573. Edited by John Bruce and Thomas Perowne. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1853.

Private Prayers, Put Forth by Authority During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Primer of 1559. The Orarum of 1560. The Preces Privatae of 1564. The Book of Christian Prayers of 1578. With An Appendix, Containing the Litany of 1544. Edited by William Clay. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1851.

REFORMATIO LEGUM ECCLESIASTICARUM, EX AUTHORITATE PRIMUM Regis Henrici 8. inchoata: Deinde per Regem EDOUARDUM, provecta, adauctàque in hunc modum, atq; nunc ad pleniorem ipsarum reformationem in lucem edita. Londini: Typis T. H. & R. H. impensis Laurentii Sadler, 1640.

Ridley, Nicholas. The Works of, D.D. Sometime Bishop of London, Martyr, 1555. Edited by Henry Christmas. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1843.

Triglot Concordia: The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.

The Two Liturgies, A.D. 1549 and A.D. 1552 with Other Documents Set Forth by Authority in the Reign of King Edward VI. Edited by Joseph Ketley. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1844.

Tyndale, [William], Frith, [John] and Barnes, [Robert]. Works of. The Fathers of the English Church: Or, A Selection From The Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant-Divines, of the Church of England. Vol. I. Printed for John Hatchard, 1808.

The Zurich Letters. Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others, with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, During the Early Part of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Hastings Robinson. The Parker Society. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1853.

Zwingli, [Ulrich] and Bullinger, [Henry]. Selections Translated With Introduction and Notes by G. W. Bromily. The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. XXIV. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.

B. Secondary Sources

Bainton, Roland. The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1952.

Brooke, V. J. K. A Life of Archbishop Parker. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Burnet, Gilbert. The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. New Edition by Nicholas Pocock. Vol. I, II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1865.

Butterworth, Charles. The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible 1340-1611. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941.

Dickens, A. G. Lollards and Protestants in the Diocese of York 1509-1558. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Dugmore, C. W. The Mass and the English Reformation. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958.

Elton, G. R. "The Reformation in England." The New Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1958.

Foxe, John. The Acts and Monuments of. New and Complete Edition with a Preliminary Dissertation by George Townsend. Edited by Stephen Cattley. London: R. B. Seeley and H. Burnside, 1861.

Gairdner, James. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century. London: Macmillan and Co., 1904.

Garrett, Christina. The Marian Exiles. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1938.

Grimm, Harold J. The Reformation Era 1500-1650. New York: Macmillan Co., 1954.

Heylyn, Peter. Ecclesia Restaurata. Cambridge: At The University Press, 1849.

Hodge, Archibald. Outline of Theology. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1868.

Hopf, Constantin. Martin Bucer and the English Reformation. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.

Hughes, Philip. The Reformation in England. 3 Vols. London: Hollis, Carter, 1956.

Hume, Martin. The Great Lord Burghley. New York: McClure, Phillips, and Co., 1906.

Jacobs, Henry E. The Lutheran Movement in England During the Reigns of Henry VIII, and Edward VI, and Its Literary Monuments: A Study in Comparative Symbolics. Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1916.

Knappen, M. M. Tudor Puritanism A Chapter in the History of Idealism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

-----. "William Tyndale--First English Puritan," Church History, V (September, 1936), 201-15.

Lea, Henry. A History of the Inquisition of Spain. Vol. II. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1906.

Litton, Edward A. Introduction to Dogmatic Theology. New revised edition by Philip E. Hughes. London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1960.

MacGregor, Geddes. The Thundering Scot: A Portrait of John Knox. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1957.

McNeill, John T. The History and Character of Calvinism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Maxwell, William. John Knox's Genevan Service Book. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1931.

Meyer, Carl S. "Cranmer's Legacy," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXVII (October 1959), 241-68.

-----. "Henry VIII Burns Luther's Books," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, IX (October 1959), 173-87.

Mozley, J. F. Coverdale and His Bibles. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

Neale, J. E. Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments (1559-1581). Oxford: Alden Press, 1933.

-----. The Elizabethen House of Commons. Oxford: Alden Press, 1949.

-----. Essays in Elizabethan History. Oxford: Alden Press, 1958.

-----. Queen Elizabeth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1934.

Norwood, Frederick. The Reformation Refugees As an Economic Force. Chicago: The American Society of Church History, 1942.

Piepkorn, Arthur C. "Anglo-Lutheran Relations during the First Two Years of the Reign of Edward VI," Concordia Theological Monthly, VI (September 1935), 670-86.

Pollard, A. F. The History of England from the Accession of Edward VI. to the Death of Elizabeth (1547-1603). Vol. VI. The Political History of England. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919.

Prescott, H. F. M. Mary Tudor. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1954.

Read, Conyers. Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1955.

Ridley, Jasper. Thomas Cranmer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Rupp, E. G. Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Mainly in the Reign of Henry VIII). Cambridge: At The University Press, 1947.

Schaff, Philip. History of the Christian Church. Reproduction of the third edition, revised 1910. Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, n.d.

Seeberg, Reinhold. Textbook of the History of Doctrine. Translated by Charles E. Hay. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952.

Short, Thomas. The History of the Church of England to the Revolution, 1688. Philadelphia: James Campbell and Co., 1843.

Smithen, Frederick J. Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation. London: James Clarke and Co., n.d.

Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion, and Other Various Occurences in the Church of England, During Queen Elizabeth's Happy Reign: Together with an Appendix of Original Papers of State, Records, and Letters. A New edition. Four vols. in seven. Vol. I. i. Vol. I. ii. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1824.

-----. Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of It, and the Emergencies of the Church of England, Under King Henry VIII. King Edward VI. and Queen Mary I. With Large Appendixes, Containing Original Papers, Records, &c. Three vols. in six. Vol. II. i. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1822.

-----. Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Wherein Said History of the Church, and the Reformation of It, During the Primacy of the Said Archbishop, Are Greatly Illustrated; and many singular Matters relating thereunto now first published (1694), In Three Books. Collected Chiefly From Records, Registers, Authentic Letters, and Other Original Manuscripts. A New Edition With Additions. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1812.

Tjernagel, Neelak Serawlook. Dr. Robert Barnes and Anglo-Lutheran Relations, 1521-1540. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1955.